

involve confiscation, which I do not favor and I do not think that anybody here favors; denouncing our just debts and obligations; or some sort of huge depression that would cause a great number of people to declare bankruptcy and wipe out debts that exist through organizations and voluntarily surrender certain assets to get people to work and pay off what they can.

I wanted to know if the Senator from Wisconsin knew of any way that we can expand this great debt economy of ours without increasing the money supply.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, the money supply has to be increased, and all economists, both liberal and conservative, agree on that. Mr. Freedman, who was an adviser to Mr. Goldwater in the last presidential campaign, said we should increase it 3 percent to 4 percent a year.

The point I make is that there is no question that in a growing economy, with more people, we are going to have more debt. Debt is the opposite of savings. The people earn more than they spend and in turn they lend it. When they lend it, it is borrowed by somebody, thus creating a debt. This keeps the economy healthy and proper but it does not mean that we have to have a constantly and a rapidly growing Federal debt. I am not sure it means we have to have a private and local debt that would grow any more rapidly than savings.

The essential action that must be taken if we are going to get by without a depression is to have enough to invest and not have the Federal Government try to come in to move it more rapidly than it would ordinarily.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Walter Wilczek, principal, Gordon Technical High School, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, source of all goodness and joy, author of liberty and truth, we humbly beg Your blessing.

Coming from a diversity of backgrounds but united by a simple faith in Your divinity, a deep appreciation for our democracy, and a common electoral ideal, we unite today in humbly acknowledging our dependence upon You in achieving those goals which ennoble our hearts and strengthen our principles.

Today, together with freedom-loving people throughout the world, we ask you to help the Members of this elected body grow in a mutual trust that will join them in works of great achievement. Make them alert to the needs of

others by creating in them that sensitivity of soul which is the key to Your kingdom. Prune from their lives the habits and attitudes that lead only to dead ends and lost opportunities. Make them ever dissatisfied with what they have achieved and ever quick to seek new goodness. Grant them an insight into the depth of Your concern for the needs of others. Grant them an integrity and dedication that is a reflection of Your concern for all Your children. Let their service be professionally good, morally correct, and humanly helpful. Give them the prudence and insight to fulfill their duties with a good conscience.

May they be honorable in their dealings, pursuant of the common good in all their deliberations, motivated by principles in all their actions. Give them the grace and courage to say what they mean and to mean what they say. May they be ever ready to endure the hate and calumnies of their opponents without wanting to pay them back with the same coin. Lastly, Heavenly Father, may they be ever conscious of this one truth: that in a profession where one is expected to satisfy so many, it is most important that they first try to satisfy You.

We ask these blessings through the intercession of Your Divine Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 617. An act to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions; and

S. 889. An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BIBLE to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, May 10 to 14, 1967.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Rev. Father Walter Wilczek, principal of Gordon Technical High School, located in my district, and which, next year, will be the largest parochial technical high school in Chicago, with an enrollment of 2,400 students,

was able to appear before us, at the invitation of the Speaker, to offer the opening prayer today, May 3, 1967, a day upon which we commemorate the Polish National Holiday.

ELECTIONS IN SUNFLOWER AND MOORHEAD, MISS.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Sunflower and Moorhead Townships, two small towns in Mississippi, were the scene of very important elections. Usually local elections in small towns receive little special attention, but in these elections Negroes for the first time had the opportunity to vote for Negro and white candidates. In spite of economic and other pressures, a substantial number of Negroes voted for Negro candidates for mayor, for councilman, and for supervisor.

These elections were unusual in other respects. The Negro candidates were supported by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which has worked so hard to bring the franchise to Mississippi Negroes. In addition, the Department of Justice took necessary action to protect the integrity of these elections. In a reversal of previous policy the Department of Justice on Monday, May 1, designated Sunflower County under section 6 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for Federal examiner, making these two townships, Sunflower and Moorhead, eligible for Federal observers.

Federal observers were present yesterday for the elections. Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Assistant Attorney General John Doar deserve commendation from all those who are committed to the exercise of the franchise by all citizens. Their action is providing a Federal presence was necessary to instill confidence in the voters, and to prevent violence. Now that the elections are over, the Department of Justice should assign Federal examiners under the authority given to the Department by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to expedite registration for the fall elections. These registrars should do everything they can to insure that Negroes have the free opportunity to register.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked a good beginning in Mississippi. The time when all citizens in Mississippi and elsewhere will have the free and equal opportunity to participate in the democratic process cannot be far away.

DESIGNATING OZARK LOCK AND DAM IN HONOR OF JAMES W. TRIMBLE

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will attempt to honor a Member of this body who served until 1966. In the 22 years James W. Trimble served the Congress of the United States, he did many worthwhile things for the country and the people of his district. Among his efforts was a continued devotion to the Arkansas River development project.

For this reason, I would like to see the Ozark Lock and Dam renamed in honor of James W. Trimble. My bill to this effect is as follows:

H.R. 9594

A bill to designate Ozark Lock and Dam (lock and dam No. 12) on the Arkansas River as the "James W. Trimble Lock and Dam".

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ozark Lock and Dam (lock and dam No. 12) now under construction on the Arkansas River, Arkansas, authorized by the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 634; P.L. 525, 79th Congress), shall be known and designated hereafter as the "James W. Trimble Lock and Dam". Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such lock and dam is referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such lock and dam as the "James W. Trimble Lock and Dam".

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on General Education may be permitted to sit this afternoon for the purpose of taking testimony during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House if this has been cleared with the minority members?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to inform the gentleman from Missouri that this has been cleared with the minority members, and it is agreeable with them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9481, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second "regular" supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year 1967. There was a general supplemental bill in the closing days of the last session, dealing with fiscal year 1967, in which it was necessary to provide additional funds for a number of agencies, including the Veterans' Administration, for benefits to veterans of the war; for mass transportation; for urban renewal; and so on. In addition, that bill was used to fund the elementary and secondary education program and the poverty program inasmuch as the basic authorizing bills for those programs came along too late to permit inclusion in the regular bills for fiscal 1967.

Earlier this session, the House approved a Southeast Asia supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1967 for further financing of the war.

The bill before us today is based upon the recommendations and the budget requests made by the President as reflected in House Documents Nos. 83, 91, and 109.

This bill, as reported from the committee, carries total appropriations of \$2,047,606,133. It is \$87,326,700 below the budget estimates of \$2,134,932,833 from the President, a reduction of about 4 percent. There is a summary of these totals by the various chapters in the bill on page 3 of the committee report which is available at the Clerk's desk.

The largest single object funded in this bill is military and civilian pay increases voted in the last session. The last Congress increased the pay of civil-

ian workers in all the agencies and branches of the Government and also increased the pay of all military personnel. There is roughly \$1,000,000,000, plus, in the bill on that account. This is not the total cost. The committee report points out that approximately \$262,000,000 or 24 percent of the total additional cost in 1967 will be absorbed by the various agencies with available funds. Military requirements in Vietnam prevent a comparable absorption rate by Defense agencies, and the Post Office Department is unable to absorb a significant amount because of costs resulting from an extremely large unanticipated rise in mail volume. Aside from these two exceptions, 53 percent of the total costs for the executive branch will be met with funds previously appropriated.

I should add that funds to finance these pay increases were not requested of the Congress in the last session, and were not then considered. We are now considering the amounts necessary to pay the additional scales of compensation agreed to last year and are now in effect.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the gentleman's opening remarks he said that this is the second regular supplemental appropriation bill. I wondered if the gentleman used the word "regular" in the context that it has become regular from the standpoint of practice, or whether supplemental appropriation bills are a regular procedure.

Mr. MAHON. The bill is actually the third supplemental appropriation bill which has been considered for fiscal 1967. Earlier this session a supplemental appropriation for the war effort in Southeast Asia was considered. It is true that, generally speaking, there are supplemental bills to finance programs that were approved by Congress in the previous year but which had not been provided for in the previous year; and to supply urgent requirements otherwise.

For example, the \$1 billion item we are now discussing grows out of the action of Congress in providing additional pay for military and civilian personnel. If we had provided the additional funds last year, very probably we would not have been in the position of getting the agencies to absorb as much as they have otherwise done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not wish to pay any disrespect to the gentleman from Texas, but I wonder if we should anticipate a third regular supplemental bill this year. Can I assume there will be one?

Mr. MAHON. I would not so assume with respect to fiscal 1967. Usually, near the end of a session there is a so-called cleanup supplemental bill, and that is another one which may be included. But that would be with respect to fiscal 1968, not 1967. One reason that there will probably be such a supplemental appropriation bill is that some of the regular authorization bills have not been approved and will not be approved in time—

such as the poverty program and some of the programs in Health, Education, and Welfare. It may be that we shall have supplementals for those programs, but they would be supplementals for fiscal 1968 rather than fiscal 1967.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 17 of the bill, under chapter VIII, "Military construction, family housing," there is provided \$5,500,000 which, it seems to me, is clearly subject to a point of order. I would ask the gentleman from Texas or some other member of the committee if there is any reason for leaving that provision in the bill in view of the fact that the authorization bill is expected to be considered in the next few days.

Mr. MAHON. That item could go out on a point of order. I understood that on yesterday a rule was requested on the authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the funds could be added in the other body if the item should go out of the bill today, but these funds have been considered necessary to implement the legislation enacted by the last Congress. The gentleman from North Carolina, who is standing near you, might have a comment to make in regard to it; he serves on the subcommittee that considered the matter.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this item is indeed subject to a point of order. The original legislation was included in the demonstration cities bill, but it provided that funds will be appropriated only on the basis of authorizations from the Armed Services Committee. This is not to provide housing for men in the military service. It is to pay the losses incurred by service personnel and civilian employees of the services in the sale of properties they own around military bases that are being closed. This is a new program. It is not to provide housing for anybody, but it is to pay individuals the losses they incur in the sale of houses they are forced to sell because of military base closures.

The original request before the Military Construction Subcommittee was \$11 million. They want to begin this program right away, because many of the people who have incurred these losses are in need of their money, and they want to get started before the new fiscal year begins in July. The subcommittee did not think they could properly expend \$11 million, so the item was reduced by 50 percent, and that is why the amount in the bill today is \$5,500,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, another major item in the bill relates to grants to States for public assistance. Last year, there was a miscalculation by the Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget as to the amount of funds necessary for public assistance grants to the States, so we have provided in this bill the sum of \$470,000,000 for additional grants to States for public assistance. It is a matching formula proposition and it is

virtually mandatory under terms of the basic legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add to the comments made by the gentleman from Texas that, as far as the House is concerned, we did accept the estimate of the Executive, and I do not believe there was any miscalculation on the part of the House of Representatives or the House Appropriations Committee on this item. The amount we allowed was the full amount that was requested.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. What I mean is that we failed to provide the amount of money needed because we did not know the precise amount. We gave all the money requested in the House version of the bill. That was the best information we had, as the gentleman well knows, but had we known all the facts we now know, we could have then provided the necessary additional funds. The executive branch could have then sent up a revised estimate.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to make that commitment now, because we know the facts as far as 1968, and we know they have underestimated in the 1968 budget, on the basis of the testimony before our committee. They have underestimated the budget on public assistance at least a quarter of a billion dollars. I would hate to add that money now. I think it is up to them to send up a supplemental request. I did not want to be in the position of committing the House and the committee to appropriate the amount needed under the best estimate, because we know the budget is underestimated now. I think it is incumbent upon the executive branch to send up a proper budget.

Mr. MAHON. It is, of course, incumbent upon the executive branch to send up a proper budget, and there would be no absolute need for Congress to take the initiative for providing money above the budget for public assistance. There is very little discretion involved in it. It must be provided under the law. I believe the committee is correct in providing the funds requested in the bill before us today.

Another cost funded in the bill, Mr. Chairman, is about \$152.3 million roughly, for the Post Office Department, largely associated with an unprecedented growth in the volume of mail.

In the bill there is also \$91,100,000 for payments to the health insurance trust fund. This must be done. We have no discretion under the law.

Then, some \$98,000,000 is in the bill for the increase in veterans compensation and pension caseloads.

Also, some \$40,200,000 is provided for emergency expenses of fighting forest fires and disaster relief.

There are other items, Mr. Chairman, which are covered in the report, but I have, I believe, mentioned the largest amounts included in the bill before us.

As I mentioned, this bill is \$87.3 million below the President's budget estimates, a reduction of about 4 percent. There

was relatively little latitude for making reductions. Highly urgent items are involved. The committee did the best it could to provide the funds necessary without providing funds that could be done without.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I heard the colloquy engaged in by the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, concerning the supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill, and I appreciate it.

My inquiry, is whether or not this additional amount will accrue to the administration's planned deficit for fiscal year 1967 or for the planned deficit for fiscal year 1968?

Mr. MAHON. This will to some extent, of course, affect the budget and the deficit for fiscal year 1967 and for fiscal year 1968. The exact amount, of course, for each cannot be calculated at this time.

This does not mean that the estimate of the deficit for fiscal year 1967, which is \$9.7 billion, will be increased by the \$2 billion included in this bill, because these supplemental funds were anticipated in the budget when the deficit estimates referred to were arrived at.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I especially appreciate the part of the comment wherein he says it will accrue to the fiscal year 1967 estimate, but I have a copy of the distinguished gentleman's letter dated March 14 in front of me, in which he makes the very point he has just now reiterated; that the planned deficit of the administration budget for fiscal year 1967 is \$9.7 billion, and I believe he lists five additional areas which might make it more than that.

Is it not true that these deficiency bills or supplemental appropriation bills usually, with a minimum of notice to the public, revert back and accrue to that which was originally planned when the budget was first submitted? I believe this is a point of public information which ought to be brought out, so that we will know and finally can go back and total up the various deficiencies and the various supplementals, and add them on to the original planned deficit, to see what it finally will become.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit these funds recommended for appropriation in this bill were taken into account in the January budget and were taken into account in arriving at the estimated deficit for fiscal year 1967 of \$9.7 billion. This is not something above and beyond the \$9.7 billion. I read from the supplementary budget message in House Document 83:

All of the 1967 requests for appropriations for the executive branch contained in this document were listed as specific items proposed for separate transmittal in the 1968 budget document, or are covered in the allowance for contingencies within the 1967 totals as shown in the 1968 budget document.

There is a similar statement in House Document No. 91.

Mr. HALL. I believe that makes it very clear.

If we do not have such contingencies as the gentleman mentioned in the second paragraph of his letter—namely, continued economic growth, enacting a 6-percent surtax proposal, a postage increase, acceleration of corporate income tax collection, approval of \$5 billion participation certificates, and other actions not yet approved by the Congress asking for more money from the Federal Treasury—he believes that the fiscal year 1967 “planned” deficit will remain at around \$9.7 billion; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The items referred to by the gentleman from Missouri, including the surtax of 6 percent, and so forth, would relate more specifically to the fiscal year 1968 budget and not, of course, to the fiscal year 1967 budget. If we do not increase revenues as recommended in the budget, then the deficit in fiscal year 1968 undoubtedly will be far above the \$8.1 billion estimated in the budget last January.

The deficit for fiscal 1968 might very well be \$15 billion or more for fiscal year 1968, depending on actions by the Congress, depending on the Executive, depending on the state of the economy, and depending on the state of the war and on any additional costs that might arise.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman so clearly distinguishing between the 1967 deficit and 1968 planned deficit, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. With further reference to the colloquy which just ended, it is true that maybe not in all instances but in many of the instances in this bill the money has already been spent and the Department has been, with authority, operating on a deficiency basis. So the mere fact that this amount is appropriated will not necessarily mean that it will involve that much in additional spending over and above what was expected to be spent last January.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's point is well taken. All of the amounts were anticipated, either specifically or in the normal contingency allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as we know now, the second supplemental appropriation bill, which we are now considering encompasses the last appropriations that Congress will be called upon to approve for the current fiscal year.

Since this bill is the last one for fiscal 1967, I think it might be appropriate for us to take a moment to review our appropriations record for the fiscal year 1967.

During the second session of the 89th Congress, we considered appropriation requests—excluding permanent appropriations—of \$114.1 billion. From these requests, Congress cut less than six-tenths of 1 percent. Let me repeat that. From these requests the Congress cut less than six-tenths of 1 percent, or not quite \$672 million, and appropriated \$113.5 billion.

I would like to point out to some of my

friends who like to discuss the 5-percent amendment with me that they say they are going to preserve to the Congress the prerogative of appropriations and they are going to see that the Congress will have the opportunity to do this appropriating. So, when you take a look at the record, the Congress has done just about exactly what the President wanted them to do. They exercised no independent judgment. Their independent judgment represents less than six-tenths of 1 percent of exactly what the President asked for. Now, where is the independent operation of the Congress? Where have we shown any real effort to do what we say we are going to do in order to economize and try to cut down on the spending in this country?

In January of this year, the administration requested \$12.3 billion in the defense supplemental. Congress reduced this request by six-tenths of 1 percent also and appropriated \$12.2 billion.

Now, in this bill we have been asked to appropriate another \$2.1 billion and the Committee on Appropriations has recommended \$2 billion which is 4 percent—and this is getting a little better—or \$87.3 million less than the request.

If no changes are made in the bill before us either by the House or the other body, Congress will have considered \$128.6 billion of appropriation requests for the current year and we will have reduced them by less than seven-tenths of 1 percent, or \$838.2 million and will have appropriated \$127.7 billion.

Of course, to this \$127 billion must be added the \$14.6 billion of permanent appropriations which are approved automatically. That gives a grand total of \$142.3 billion in appropriations for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, a cut of less than seven-tenths of 1 percent in requested appropriations for this year is a pretty sorry economy record for this Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, if I may just say one further thing: The agencies, we know, when they send these budget requests up here, pad them a little and expect a cut of a little better than seven-tenths of 1 percent. Now I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to exchange views here with the gentleman from Ohio.

There is a popular belief in the country that budget estimates are often padded, and in some cases they are; I would say they probably are. But in many cases they are not.

For example, in this bill there was no padding in the aid to States for public welfare. We appropriated a little less than was requested last year. The request was about \$400 million lower than it should have been. So, there was not any padding in this request. It was too lean. Many of the budget requests are subject to almost exact calculation. For example, the pay increases that are pending before us now are in the amount of about \$1 billion. There is not too much room in that field in which to pad these requests.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do think the executive branch in recent years has performed a better job in making precise and realistic figures available to the Congress with which to carry out the programs which are recommended.

It is true that we do not always agree with the programs that are recommended.

With respect to the impact of the Congress upon this matter, last year the Congress, without the use of the Bow amendment, worked its own will with respect to legislation.

For example, in Defense, we went above the budget request last year in the sum of \$403 million, in exercising the judgment of the Congress. Of course, that was not enough, in a sense. We have already had to provide \$12 billion in additional funds this year, against the opposition of a number of Members.

Mr. Chairman, the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill last year was \$380 million above the President's budget. So, this goes up and down.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that Congress does exercise considerable judgment in acting upon these various appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to rounding off the figures or totaling the figures, there may be widespread divergence, percentage-wise.

But, there was not too much room in which to cut the pending bill. However, I would estimate and hope that my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], would concur in this evaluation of the situation.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman, if he does concur in the estimate that in the appropriation bills this year reductions will be made to a greater degree than was true last year?

Mr. BOW. Well, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, that I sincerely hope there will be greater reductions this year than last year. Further, I would like to say I agree that the gentleman from Texas has been making a great effort to do that. The great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], has been attempting to do that. I hope the House of Representatives will follow the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Ohio in some of the reductions which we hope to make in these appropriation bills, and that we can make a better record than we did last year.

May I say to the gentleman from Texas, however—

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, one of the problems involved—

Mr. BOW. The examples we have given of not padding—well, actually, we saw last year where the executive branch reduced the budget in order to make it look better in areas where they knew Congress would have to put the money back into those programs.

You talk about welfare, for instance. Of course, when you get into the question of welfare Congress should not let people who are needy be hurt.

The gentleman from Mississippi had a request here that would have curbed the free school lunch program. The budget looked pretty good but when Congress examined it, Congress readily exercised its independent judgment in putting the money back for the school lunch program. I am sure there was no one downtown who did not know the Congress was going to restore the free lunch and special milk programs.

But I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that in many, many instances when they get these budgets ready downtown they do kind of just push them up in the top areas, in the areas where they think they might have a little problem with the Congress, they just push them up a little so that when it comes up here Congress can take a good look at it and say "Well, we cut so much out of it."

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe we all ought to do everything in our power, reasonably within our power, during this session of the Congress, to hold expenses to the lowest practicable level in view of the fact we are confronted with a heavy deficit this year, a deficit perhaps of as much as \$15 billion for fiscal year 1968?

It does seem to me we can all agree—and I know the gentleman from Ohio and I agree—that we must do a workmanlike job in trying to hold spending in line as far as reasonably possible.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Texas; indeed I do.

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any Congress ever cut less in a session than we did in the last Congress. I am not sure of this, of course, but from what I have been able to find out in checking on this, that this was probably the poorest record that Congress has made.

I do not believe this can be attributed entirely to the fact that the administration's 1967 budget was a particularly tight one.

Except for the 1968 fiscal year, no budget offered greater opportunities for reasonable and responsible cuts than does the budget this year. The evidence, I believe, proves the fact that it was not a tight budget. That is reflected by the President's unilateral action last November when he ordered budgetary cutbacks of \$5.3 billion.

After we had exercised our independent judgment up here, and only cut a very small portion, the President was able to find \$5.3 billion which he froze. So he sort of said to us, after that, "Maybe I sent you too much, and we had better just not spend this \$5.3 billion."

By its actions with respect to the 1967 budget, Congress has certainly won, I believe, the indisputable right to be called a rubber stamp for the administration on appropriations.

With respect to the appropriation bills for fiscal 1968, again I agree with the gentleman from Texas that he has done an excellent job in some of these areas, because we have improved somewhat, as is evidenced by the fact that the District of Columbia budget was balanced by the committee. The Treasury-Post Office bill was cut about 1.5 percent below budget

requests, and the Interior bill was cut about 6 percent below requests.

Mr. Chairman, on that point I would like to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, for the work she did on that bill when the committee cut it 6 percent. I tried to cut it more, but I still believe the gentlewoman from Washington did an excellent job in her subcommittee by cutting it 6 percent.

So apparently in 1968 we are moving in the right direction. I hope we can do better; we must exercise a much greater economy effort on the 10 remaining bills if we are to avoid a 1968 budget deficit of some \$18 billion to \$20 billion. That is what it will be, a budget deficit of between \$18 billion to \$20 billion unless we do a better job.

The bill before us includes some \$90 million in appropriations which were cut from the regular bills last year. These restorations are: \$12 million for the crop land adjustment program, \$700,000 for the conservation reserve program, \$75,000 for the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel, \$16 million for public housing, \$15 million for vocational rehabilitation, and \$46 million for public assistance.

As disturbing as it is to be called upon to restore these modest cuts that were made last year, it is even more discouraging when we find that they have asked and the committee has agreed to fund 11 new programs to the tune of almost \$28 million.

May I say now, I hope this House, will make it a point not to finance new programs in supplemental appropriation bills. We have been slipping into this practice over the past years. This is not the purpose of supplemental appropriations and I hope that we will use extreme care in the future on this question.

I think the initial funding of these programs should have been considered in the regular bills for 1968.

The current fiscal year will be almost over before this bill becomes law and a delay of a few weeks in the funding of these programs would make no material difference in their operation. But a delay would have given the committee a chance to consider the relative importance of these programs to other programs in the pyramiding of Federal spending.

Often I think, when I stand here in the well to take up these minutes of your time, that every time the minute hand goes around that clock just once—every minute—you are spending \$29,000 in interest on the national debt—\$29,000 every minute in interest on the national debt. That is a figure that everybody can understand.

Since we have practically no choice other than to fund most of the items in this bill, I reluctantly support its enactment. But I shall not have this attitude, however, with respect to the remaining bills for 1968. If they are not cut substantially by the committee, I shall continue my efforts on the floor to reduce them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman, the ranking minority member of the full Committee on Appropriations yielding to me.

I simply have a question concerning the committee report on this second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967.

On the top of page 25, there is a paragraph with the heading "Payment to Trust Funds for Health Insurance for the Aged."

In this paragraph, it states that this includes over \$91 million, most of it necessary because of the original 1967 appropriation based upon 15 million aged persons voluntarily enrolling in the supplementary medical insurance program whereas over 17.5 million actually did enroll.

Then it goes on to say that other moneys are needed in addition to that to pay the \$3 per month enrollment premium on those extra numbers due to the increase in the workload of the Social Security Administration.

I would like to ask the gentleman, with that background in mind, whether this additional workload involved moneys spent for the teams that went around the country enticing our elderly people to sign up for medicare and including the prepared movie films which were shown to them—or whether that money came out of the OEO funds, as was purported at that time.

Mr. BOW. I regret to say to the gentleman from Missouri that I cannot respond to his question directly because I am not familiar with that item. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] who serves on that subcommittee and who is present perhaps can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MICHEL. In answer to the gentleman, I am sure some of this money requested here can be attributed to the fact that there was a Madison Avenue propaganda carried on. But to break it out into specific figures here, I am afraid I could not do that without a reference to our hearing record and then I doubt whether I could give the gentleman a meaningful figure.

Mr. BOW. Perhaps a Member on the majority side may answer the gentleman's question. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the chairman of the subcommittee, can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, both groups were engaged in this, both OEO and the Social Security people. That is true. The purpose was to exert every effort to advise people who had a right to know and who should know what the benefits, that Congress had voted for them, might be. This was done. I find no fault with that. It was done by both the OEO and the Social Security Administration.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for his response. I respect his belief that this was a "right" that was being propagandized and perhaps oversold. But I am not in agreement with that belief that it is a "right." I think it is a tax. I think it is a benefit perhaps—but a right to tax funds—no.

I wonder if the gentleman does not feel that this is misappropriation of funds, before the fact, in order to sell a pro-

gram, whether it be a right or a benefit? Certainly I for one believe, that this is where the Congress is expected to exercise restraint in appropriations, that is, in not making up funds that are used against the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and other laws of the land to propagandize, to make movies, and to sell as a right or as a benefit or any other measure by supplemental appropriations, as badly as it may have been needed.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman's opinion is always interesting, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not agree. All of the funds under this heading in the bill are required to be appropriated by the Social Security Act, and the committee agreed with the law.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would simply say there is no provision of the social security law that requires that the participants be propagandized; therefore, I would object to this portion of the appropriation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the members of the committee today that while this is a substantial supplemental bill, involving \$2 billion, it is not all of the supplemental funds that are going to be asked of Congress. In fact, yesterday the President bypassed the House and its Committee on Appropriations and sent straight to the Senate another supplemental request that is not even included in this bill, and it is for \$75 million of additional funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This procedure eliminates any opportunity for Members on the House side to raise questions about the need for these funds or to consider the justifications. My guess is that the \$75 million will be put in the bill by the other body, and the first time we will be confronted with it is in conference.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget tried to get in touch with me on Monday, but he was unable to do so. I did talk to him yesterday. He wanted to notify the Appropriations Committee that this additional supplemental of \$75 million would be required. He explained that the question of whether additional funds would be required had been before the executive branch for some time.

These additional funds, in the sum of \$75 million, are being requested for the purpose of providing employment for youth, in cities principally, during the summertime when they are not in school, to provide them with employment opportunities, for swimming pools, for recreational assistance, and so forth, in order to stimulate stability and profitable utilization of time by the youngsters of the country, who, too often, find themselves out of school with no chance to get a job. This is the kind of request that came up.

I believe the request is well founded and I, myself, expect to support it.

I would say further, the administration felt so strongly about this matter that it apparently has breached its tentative January budget totals of new obligational authority to some extent in order to request these funds for the summer program for youth in the congested areas of the Nation. I am referring to new obligational authority requested, as shown in the January budget.

Of course, may I add that we have reduced the NOA requests for 1967 in this supplemental bill, and in the defense supplemental bill, by considerably more than what we are talking about here. So that overall, the totals will not have been breached, I would say.

I should have told the gentleman from North Carolina, and particularly the gentleman from Ohio, previously. But we have been so engaged in hearings and otherwise that I just have not had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee, but I would say that if the Director of the Bureau of the Budget undertook to get in touch with him about this item on Monday of this week, he was several days too late in doing so, because we marked up this bill in the various subcommittees days ago and the full Committee on Appropriations approved this bill on April 28, 1967—last Friday.

I do not know why it took the Director of the Bureau of the Budget all this time to advise the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House that he was going to ask for this \$75 million in the Senate and thereby bypass the House altogether.

I do not believe they suddenly decided to ask for this money between the time the House committee acted on this supplemental bill last Friday and Monday when the Budget Bureau Director sought to communicate with the gentleman from Texas. I do not believe it is dealing fairly with the House side of the Congress for the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to ignore us and send requests of this nature to the other body, because we have an equal right and a responsibility to hear the testimony, to examine the witnesses, and to find out something about these programs.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in every session, when we have a supplemental request, as the experienced gentleman from North Carolina knows, we have to have a cutoff date on the submission of supplemental requests. Therefore, if there are other supplemental items, they have to go to the other body—and there usually are some last minute supplemental requests that go directly there.

I believe the executive branch has been

perfectly fair and correct in its actions here. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised the Committee on Appropriations of the House that this matter has been discussed over a period of weeks. But the President was very reluctant to ask for additional funds, especially funds that would breach his January budget. Finally it was determined that this should be done, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget called me, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and said he realized that they preferred to send a supplemental request to the House and realized that the House felt very keenly about this matter, and asked if it would be satisfactory with the House for the request in this instance to go to the Senate. So I told the Director of the Bureau of the Budget it was perfectly appropriate to send it to the other body, and that I would certainly have no objection to that procedure in this instance.

This will not preclude our having hearings on the matter, and the House working its will. It can reduce these funds or eliminate them, if it so desires. I do not believe the House will desire so to do. But I do believe we should recognize that the executive branch acted in absolute good faith in dealing with this matter.

Mr. JONAS. I do not charge that the President or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, had ulterior motives in bypassing the House as they are doing in this instance. I am now merely calling attention to the fact that notwithstanding this is a \$2 billion supplemental bill for funds that are asked to be appropriated over and above the tremendous sums we appropriated last year, it does not tell the whole story. I am not so sure that, as I stand here today, this additional supplemental request for \$75 million that just went over to the Senate yesterday will be the end of the requests. It is very likely that additional funds will be requested in other supplementals before the current year is over.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is no assurance. I, myself, anticipate there will be additional supplemental requests. There were last year, and the year before that, and the year before that, and the year before that. There always is a closing supplemental in the session, but as I indicated earlier, it will deal with fiscal 1968, not fiscal 1967.

Mr. JONAS. I brought this subject up today because I believe the members of the Committee here today are entitled to know that this supplemental request for an additional \$75 million was sent over to the Senate yesterday. You will never hear of it again until it shows up in a conference report. It will be in the conference report on this bill but there will be little opportunity for Members to debate or discuss it in a conference report.

I just do not believe this was an emergency which suddenly developed and believe this item should have been sent to the House as the other items in the bill were sent to us on March 13, 1967.

If this \$75 million is so essential, I cannot understand why it was not included in the request which came up to

the House in the regular way on March 13. Then we could have considered it in the hearings, and it could have been incorporated in our bill today, and there could have been discussion of it in the written report and on the floor today, instead of having it go to the Senate and be put in the bill over there. This procedure will preclude any meaningful consideration or debate on it by Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I am a little disturbed over the unhappy frame of mind of my friend from North Carolina.

Speaking for what I believed to be the view of the Appropriations Committee, I told the executive branch—I told Mr. Schultze, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—to hold these supplemental requests down to the lowest possible figure and not to send supplemental requests to us that were not highly urgent and needed. I said something to the effect, "Insofar as possible, do not send down these new programs to be initiated in a supplemental appropriation bill."

It could have been sent down earlier, but I urged that they wait until the last minute and squeeze every bit of water out of these requests that they possibly could. I believe that is the way we ought to do business. We do not want to encourage supplementals. We want to discourage them.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I am 100 percent in agreement with his last remark. If the gentleman believes I am complaining about squeezing all the water out of these requests, he misunderstood what I said or else I am not making myself clear.

I am not suggesting that they send down more supplemental requests. I am complaining about their sending this one to the Senate and bypassing the House. The members of this Committee of the Whole sitting here today will never have an opportunity to do anything about this request when the conference report comes back. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MAHON. We will have every opportunity.

Mr. JONAS. What opportunity?

Mr. MAHON. We can veto the whole amount, or we can agree to a portion of it, in the conference with the other body.

Mr. JONAS. I do not believe we ought to deny the members of the Committee an opportunity to consider this request. When I say "committee" I do not mean the Committee on Appropriations, but I mean the Committee of the Whole House sitting here today, as well as the entire House membership.

I believe an important item of \$75 million ought to be in a bill that can be debated on the floor of the House. There will not be any way for that to be done, under the limited procedures and time available for discussing a conference report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the essentiality of the \$75 million, everyone

in this country knows that we have problems in the rural areas and we have problems in the cities. There are teeming thousands of unemployed youths on the streets of our cities. We are trying to give some of them jobs in the Congress, as interns, and various agencies are trying to do so.

Hundreds of thousands of requests have gone out from the Government to private enterprise, urging them to employ youths.

I would say that there is a high degree of urgency to the objective for which the \$75 million is being requested. Whether or not the money is needed may be another question, but the urgent need for doing something about the unemployed youths who roam the streets of the cities in the summertime without jobs is a matter of very great consequence, it seems to me.

Mr. JONAS. If my friend will permit me, he is making an argument that is not even directed to the point I make. I am not discussing the merits of this \$75 million. I am not questioning the need to provide employment for the youth of the land. I am not questioning now the necessity of building swimming pools for them. That is not the point of my mentioning this. My point is that I do not think the procedure being followed with respect to this request for \$75 million is a proper way to function. I think that the Members of this body ought to have a chance to consider this particular.

I insist that if this is a matter of such urgency, it did not suddenly come to light on May 2, 1967. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President certainly should have been aware of this need on March 13, when they sent the regular supplemental appropriation bill up to the House on which we conducted our hearings and which we are considering today. I am not arguing that this is an unsound or unwise item, but merely that this branch of Congress should have an opportunity to consider, debate, and act on it, and we will not have such an opportunity under the procedure being followed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. The Government has many millions of dollars available for utilization in the poverty program and in the Headstart program. Some of this \$75 million will be for the Headstart program. The Government has a lot of money available for some of these programs, and they are making a study and a survey of this matter. There has been a great deal of concern and interest in it. It was finally decided to send this request down. It was hoped that it would not be necessary, but finally that request was sent down.

What could they do other than call it to the attention of the House Committee on Appropriations? Would it be agreeable to send it to the other body? If they did not send it down now and get it in the pending bill, summer will be upon us and they would not have the necessary funds to accomplish this. This is the only logical vehicle that we can use in order to give consideration to the request. It is true it is unusual but not an unprece-

dented thing. It is not a technique which is ordinarily used, but to some extent it is used every year. Last year a number of items were sent to the Senate because the House closed their hearings on certain portions of the bill. So I believe that we are handling this matter in the best way possible under the circumstances.

Mr. JONAS. I will conclude by repeating what I have said many times; namely, I am not debating the merits of this proposition, but am merely calling to the attention of the Members of the House that by following this procedure they will be denied any opportunity to strike this item or to reduce it if they want to, or to even consider it or to discuss it at reasonable lengths. I am not referring now merely to the members of the House Committee on Appropriations but to this body itself. I think any item as important as this and which is as critical as the gentleman from Texas indicates it is, that the facts on it should have been known to the President before last Monday. They surely must have been known to him in March when he sent the items up here which we are debating today. I for one, not because I am jealous of the prerogatives of the Committee on Appropriations, because goodness knows we have plenty to do without asking for more work, but I do not think it is fair to the membership of this body to have this kind of a procedure used because it denies to them any opportunity to give this request for \$75 million any real consideration.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] in protesting as a non-member of the Committee on Appropriations the including in the conference report on this bill—and that is the way we are apparently going to get it—the \$75 million to provide for the employment of youths during this coming summer and construction of the Lord knows how many swimming pools. That program ought to come before the House on a regular legislative basis instead of installing it in a conference report without the benefit of hearings and without the benefit of any evidence from the House Committee on Appropriations in justification for this program and the spending of \$75 million.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that for once I am in total agreement with him. Most of this money will be directed through the Labor Department and the community action program and the city work program. I am not satisfied, for instance, that in New York City we have done a great job of finding where all of the Federal money is that is up there right now.

I am not inferring in any way that the Office of Economic Opportunity has more funds than are required on a national basis, but I know for a fact that there is a sum of \$5.5 million in New York City which the city is unable to spend because there has not been the sufficient and proper planning for its expenditure.

It is asking until next October, in order to obtain additional time during which to spend the money required to be spent by July 1.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that if they do not know how the money which they have now is going to be expended, I would like to know how they will spend \$75 million next year that may be appropriated by our committee in charge of this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, working with what they do, and in working to find a place in which to spend this money—a place in which to expend it that is not being expended—they complain about lack of sufficient size and recruiting conditions in order to bring into being the big administrative staff, one with which to draw up new strategies and so on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] for his statement.

I really arose, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] a question to be found on page 40 of the bill, line 19, entitled "Missions to International Organizations":

\$70,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations."

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would describe briefly what is proposed to be done here?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is the method whereby we use part of the sum of about \$23 million standing to the credit of the State Department unspent, entitled "Loan to the United Nations," which was appropriated a few years back and not used, for the purpose of paying these increased pay costs of employees. In other words, instead of appropriating fresh dollars in this bill, we are making use of part of a fund which is lying idle and probably will not be used.

Further, Mr. Chairman, we have used another part of this fund at another place in this bill. I believe the gentleman will find that it is also used at page 18, line 16, of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me why the appropriation of \$70,000 on "Missions to International Organizations"?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is Pay Act money for employees. The gentleman from Iowa probably voted for it last year.

Mr. GROSS. Voted for what?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Employees' Pay Act money. You voted for the Federal employees' pay raise last year; did you not?

Mr. GROSS. I do not remember. I have voted against them and I have voted for them but I do not recall how I voted on this particular one.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Iowa has always been a great friend of the Federal employee and particularly the Post Office worker. That fact stands out clear in my mind

after all these years. I thought that surely the gentleman from Iowa would be one who would vote with me to give them a slight increase in pay last year. This is part of the bill for it.

Mr. GROSS. I have not always voted for them. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], I am sure, has always voted for them.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will please yield further, I would say that the gentleman from Iowa has voted for them so often that he has colored my mind to the point that it seems that the gentleman is the greatest friend of Federal employees here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Not on the basis of having voted for and against pay bills, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has also been here a few years. The gentleman may recall that I was one of the few who voted to sustain President Eisenhower's veto of a pay bill and the gentleman from New York did not.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will kindly yield further, there were very few Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle who had the nerve in those days to stand up and defend President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa such additional time as he may consume.

Mr. GROSS. On page 31 of the bill—and I do not know which subcommittee handled this matter—there is this item:

"Export control," \$43,000, of which not to exceed \$20,000 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs, . . .

What is this? Is this also for pay increases, or does this in any way affect the export control on the boycott of Rhodesia? That is what I am really trying to find out.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It has nothing to do with Rhodesia or Timbuktu. It has to do with the wages of Federal employees, the same as the previous item to which the gentleman referred. This is Pay Act money, but here we use good, clean, new cash rather than the use of that fund that is lying dormant, the so-called loan to the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. The next item: "Environmental Science Services Administration."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is the new name, if the gentleman will permit me to explain, for the combined Weather Bureau-Coast and Geodetic Survey, and a former part of the National Bureau of Standards.

I would admit to the gentleman that this new outfit has not advanced very far in success, and has been able to spend more money than when we had the three items separately. The Weather Bureau was bad enough prior to this, but now that it is part of this trio, oh-oh.

Mr. GROSS. Then on page 27, under "Funds appropriated to the President:

Economic assistance: 'Administrative expenses', Agency for International Development \$1,194,000, to be derived," and so forth and so on.

What is this expenditure about? I could not find anything in the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is not an item that my subcommittee handled. I would suggest to the gentleman that all of the items he has referred to which begin at page 23 of the bill are included under title II, and are for one purpose, increased pay costs of employees.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Increased what?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Increased pay costs, as a result of the increases in wages and salaries that were enacted by the Congress a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me this: Does this item, "Higher education for international understanding," represent a new agency in Government?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will try to explain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I would say to the gentleman that that is not in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Was it stricken, or what happened to it?

Mr. FLOOD. The committee in its wisdom decided it was a new program, and it was not in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. What is "higher education for international understanding"? I thought we already understood international understanding.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will yield further, it is not before the committee at this time; it is a separate bill.

Mr. GROSS. But it is still kicking around; it will probably be in the regular bill?

Mr. FLOOD. When this subject comes up later we will deal with it.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman would give me an adequate explanation of what "Higher education for international understanding" is?

Mr. FLOOD. I would suggest the gentleman read the report. Whatever is in this bill is in the report, and is very eloquently stated.

Mr. GROSS. I thought we all had a complete understanding that "international understanding" means all we have to do is provide the money. I did not know we had to understand anything else, and I did not know we had to have higher education to go along with that understanding.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman can be sure at least the committee will.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman can be sure at least the committee will. I am not sure about the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, following up the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], relative to several of these items having to do with pay costs, I would say as a matter of fact \$1,080,000,000 of this \$2 billion bill is in

increased pay costs that came as a result of what we did here last year by way of authorizing legislation.

That brings me to another point. There was a dialog or a colloquy here earlier about \$470 million needed in grants to States for public assistance.

It is obvious to me that this is one of those areas where the budget when it is presented to us always has room for a half-billion-dollar cushion in the administration's favor.

If we go back to last year, we were asked for a supplemental appropriation, I think, of \$460 million for grants to the States for public assistance. This year it is \$470 million in a supplemental. That brings the total for grants to States for public assistance in this fiscal year to \$4,200,000,000. In the 1968 budget we see an item for the fiscal year 1968 of \$4,200,000,000 for public assistance.

Since we are already at this level, you can bet your bottom dollar that when we are back here a year from now, it will be to come up with a supplement for another half billion dollars. Because that is what has happened over the last 4 or 5 years in grants to States for public assistance. They have gone up a half billion dollars each year notwithstanding all the claims during the course of debate on medicare that with its enactment we would see these grants to States for public assistance go down decidedly. Just the opposite has proven to be the case.

Now for the Post Office Department, you have \$373,800,000 in additional money requested because of the increased volume of mail. We cannot tell the people that they should not mail what they are mailing. Maybe we should increase postal rates to make up the difference. But this is one of those items again where we are locked in.

With reference to the new Office of Transportation or Department of Transportation, there is \$65 million here in the supplemental appropriation to get it on its way. That will be increased—you can bet your bottom dollar—each year subsequently.

We have not funded, in this supplemental appropriation, any programs which have not been authorized. I think this is a good tack for us to take. I do not think we ought to be funding in these supplemental appropriations anything that did not come to us in a budget request from the administration. If there is any move today to put in money that is not budgeted and which is not authorized, I think it is completely uncalled for.

You have heard several of the gentlemen here talking of what we are facing by way of a deficit in this coming year and by the President's own admission it will be \$9 billion provided a 6-percent surtax is imposed to raise \$4.5 billion.

How many of you are going to vote for a tax increase in this session of the Congress?

I just got my poll back from my congressional district yesterday and I put it in the RECORD. The results on that particular item alone show that 89 percent or 90 percent of the people in my district say, "No, we do not favor a 6-percent surtax."

But conversely on the question, would you prefer to have Federal spending cut back \$5 billion regardless of the popularity of the program, the figures were practically reversed percentagewise. The people in my congressional district overwhelmingly favor our cutting down on the level of Federal expenditures rather than raising taxes.

Sometime in this session of the Congress, we are going to have to face up to our dismal financial plight. Look at it. A predicted \$9 billion deficit that can be raised to \$14 billion without a tax increase and with some faulty budget estimates it can easily grow several billion more. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] predicted earlier in this debate, it could very well be \$18 to \$20 billion.

So I say, we have to firmly resolve here and at least I have to as a Member of this House and I am sure the other 50 members of our Committee on Appropriations will have to take the position that we just cannot be funding unauthorized programs and unbudgeted items in these bills unless we want and unless we are ready to vote for a tax increase.

I for one would much prefer a reduction in spending over an increase in taxes, but we better do one or the other pretty soon because we are plunging deeper and deeper into debt and heading for the biggest deficit ever except for the World War years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree more, that we ought to cut back seriously in certain areas of nonessential spending—notably farm subsidies and some areas of public works—and through a stretchout of certain aspects of the space program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a serious mistake, however, not to appropriate one penny of the \$12.5 million supplemental requested by the President for the Teacher Corps for fiscal year 1967.

The Teacher Corps has limped along on an appropriation of \$7.5 million in fiscal 1967 out of a total authorization of \$65 million.

To date, the Teacher Corps has trained some 1,207 corpsmen who now serve in 275 schools in 111 school systems in every State but Alaska.

There are two projects in New York State, one in New York City and the other in Buffalo. There are 93 Teacher Corpsmen in the New York City project, serving in 16 schools. Buffalo has four veteran teachers and 19 interns working in five innercity schools.

However, Teacher Corps personnel now in service represent only about one-quarter of the anticipated size of the program which had to be cut for lack of sufficient funding. The Appropriations Committee has now denied the \$12.5 million in supplemental funds that the Office of Education has requested to expand the program this year.

Commissioner Howe testified before the Education and Labor Committee recently that it was his hope that, with this \$12.5 million and the \$36 million requested by the President for fiscal year

1968, the enrollment of the Teacher Corps could be increased to 6,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is a creative and farsighted program that we cannot permit to wither away for lack of adequate financing. It is a unique approach to meeting the special educational needs of the disadvantaged child—an approach that has proven itself successful even on this limited scale. It would be a serious omission to fail to provide this supplemental appropriation of \$12.5 million now and the full authorization for fiscal year 1968 that is necessary if the Teacher Corps is to recruit and train new members, as well as permit present corpsmen to make plans for the coming academic year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to bring a little history back to this body. I recall that last year the House appropriated no funds for the Teacher Corps. We went to conference, and the conference agreed to put \$7,500,000 in the bill, but we came back from conference with the understanding at that time that the \$7.5 million was to phase out the Teacher Corps. We came back and made that announcement to the House, and I hope we stand by it because that was the conference agreement. I hope those who were the conferees and those who agreed to the conference report here in the House will stand by that position.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the bottom of page 2 of the supplemental appropriation bill. Set forth there is an item as follows:

For an additional amount for "Cropland adjustment program", \$12,000,000.

My curiosity was aroused when I saw that printed item, and I called the Department of Agriculture, talking to the official that deals with this program. I asked him if it is true that our Government is still signing contracts to rent land to take it out of production. It seemed very curious to me that that should be the case in a period of history in which the demand for food is on the rise and our Government has seen fit to cut back some 20 percent on the amount of food that will be programed under Public Law 480 because, according to Government officials, the level of stocks is getting too low.

I found, incredibly, that since the first of the year contracts in excess of \$35 million have been signed under this program.

I would like to ask anyone who would like to respond if there would be objection to an amendment, assuming the amendment is proper, which would have the effect of shutting off any further contracting under this program for the balance of the fiscal year. To me it seems almost beyond belief that we would use tax dollars to rent land which could be planted to corn and wheat.

I would be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my

learned friend in regard to these programs that I have a somewhat similar record along this line, too. I opposed the renting of land under Secretary Benson.

I have opposed it under the present administration, believing that other solutions are better than the renting of land and paying to keep it out of production. That is no solution to the farm problem.

However, insofar as the immediate situation is concerned, the moneys that are now in this bill are to make payments on past-due obligations on contracts that are already entered into. The reduction of a half-million dollars that was made there was so they might hold this a little more closely than otherwise.

Insofar as what the gentleman seeks, I might tell him it has not been realized. In our hearings this year I raised the serious question as to whether we should proceed to enlarge this type program under present conditions. It is my belief—and I am not the Speaker nor the Parliamentarian—that any amendment offered would be subject to a point of order.

Those administrative funds which are used to carry out this program were appropriated last year and are not in the request for funds in this bill, so I do not believe that would be reachable by any amendment at this time. I would be compelled to make the point of order if the amendment were offered.

But I can assure the gentleman that I have raised this same serious question in the hearings this year, and doubtless the committee may take that into consideration in the determination of what they will recommend in the regular bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. The same department that has been signing these contracts for land rent has been urging wheat farmers to plant millions of additional acres in wheat this year. So it seems to me the appropriate time for Congress to take action to end this sort of thing is now. I thank the gentleman for his interest to that end.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my friend from Illinois that on this crop adjustment program the appropriation for this current year was \$50 million. We did know that the request indicated they really needed the \$62.5 million, as I recall the history of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding further.

As I said, the problem, I believe, came

up from the other body, recognizing that they wanted to make some cuts in conference. We were more responsive in trying to fund fully what was requested of us at that particular time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize we will have to pay this.

Mr. MICHEL. In the budget request for 1968 for this same item, there is an item calling for \$90 million, as against this total in fiscal year 1967 of \$62.5 million. As the chairman indicates, we are going to take a close look at this when we take up the regular bill for 1968.

I may say I have voiced my opposition to this program. In the last few weeks, as I recall, one farmer in my own district will realize a payment of \$18,000 for his land put into this program. He just decided that it is a lot easier to go into town and to retire and get the big Government check than to work for it as he would normally do.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is it the gentleman's understanding that there were no funds for salaries under the ASCS in this bill? I thought I saw it transcribed here, but at the moment I cannot spot it.

Mr. MICHEL. I am sorry I cannot come up with the figure at the moment but will be happy to dig it out for you.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman explain to me why there is an item of \$246,000 for a Federal Crop Insurance Corporation? I thought the fees charged the farmers for this crop insurance were adequate to meet all expenses of the program. Can the gentleman shed any light on that, or can the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have the exact figures, but as the gentleman will recall through the years the crop insurance program failed and was started up again on an experimental bill. The program's administrative expenses were paid by the Federal Government under the new act. Our subcommittee has recommended, and Congress has approved, passing over to the corporation more and more of the burden of administrative expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. The Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. As time has passed we have gradually pushed more and more of the total request for administrative costs on the corporation, but still a considerable portion is paid by the Government.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman tell me if it is the intention of his subcommittee to seek to place this entirely on a self-financing basis in the near future; and, if so, when?

Mr. WHITTEN. The words "near future" trouble me, because I do not know how soon that could be. I hope that sooner or later the administrative costs may be covered.

I would say at this point that the program has proved to be much more economical to the Government than the amount of relief the Government voted for these areas now taken care of by crop loss claims insured by the Corporation. I believe the program is a very vital one. We must not carry over the administra-

tive costs to the point of jeopardizing a program which is far more economical than the previous practice, in my opinion.

We are working toward that end. How soon we can reach that objective I would not want to say.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, chapter VII of title I of the pending bill contains several items for legislative branch housekeeping. The total is \$2,845,600. In addition, \$1,980,560 is in title II for the legislative branch for increased pay costs along with the rest of the Government agencies generally. I should say that, in accord with custom, these figures do not embrace amounts relating solely to the other body; they will be inserted as amendments over there.

The various items are delineated in the committee report which is here at the desk, and in the printed committee hearings. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, there is the customary provision for the widow of the late Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

There are funds for furniture and furnishings for the Cannon Office Building now being remodeled, as Members know. We understand that the first phase of the remodeling—roughly half of the job—will be substantially completed this summer so that, barring any complicating factors, about half of the 138 renovated and enlarged suites should be ready for occupancy at that time. The second half should be ready about a year or so later. When funds were appropriated for remodeling, including conversion of Members' suites from two rooms to three rooms, no provision was made for any furniture or furnishings other than carpeting for the enlarged suites. Even under the best of expedition, all the new furnishings cannot possibly be delivered in time for initial occupancy. The Clerk's plan of outfitting is patterned generally after that followed in the Rayburn Building but with certain deletions for items that he thinks can be salvaged from the old furniture and for several items more appropriately chargeable to Members' stationery allowances.

All procurements are to be made on an open, competitive, bid basis.

There are funds included to help meet the added expense of enlarged telephone allowance provisions approved by the House last June, in House Resolution 901, and continued in the present Congress. The amount, \$450,000, as the report states, is somewhat of a guess until more cost experience is available.

Then there is \$261,600 to replace funds earlier drawn from the contingent fund to credit to Members the additional stationery allowance authorized by House Resolution 112 of the present Congress.

There is a small additional allowance of \$5,000 for the physician's office for emergency medical equipment and for supplies and drugs.

We have also included funds to engage outstanding experts to restore the four valuable paintings, including the beautiful "Signing of the Constitution," that were damaged when a man ran amuck here in the House wing last December. It is delicate work, requiring expert talent, and it is costly. But the paintings

cannot be permitted to remain in their present condition.

And there is \$150,000 for added volume of work at the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

Taking into account all phases of the bill dealing with the legislative branch, Mr. Chairman, a total of \$4,826,160 is in the bill. Leaving out all the complicated ins and outs, that amount, as the committee report shows, is below the formal budget requests by the net amount of \$66,700; it is below the official requests—formal and informal—by \$2,045,700.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 9481, the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1967.

I am particularly pleased that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to include in the measure \$643,000 for the expansion of five national cemeteries, including Fort Rosecrans in my own city of San Diego.

If approved, the money will provide much-needed—though temporary—relief for Fort Rosecrans and the other national burial grounds.

The House should know that Fort Rosecrans, once one of the most active national cemeteries in the country, was closed last September to new applications. The 10-acre addition that is now proposed would reopen the cemetery for about 15 months, according to testimony given the Appropriations Committee by a representative of the Army's Office of Support Services.

Obviously, longer range solutions must be sought to the many built-in problems of our national cemetery system. We Californians are painfully aware of the inherent injustices in the system as it is now constituted. Only five of the 98 national cemeteries are located in the seven westernmost States, and of these, only three are in California, the most populous State in the Nation.

I believe that the most equitable answers could be provided by a Site Selection Committee on National Cemeteries, with membership from both the Government and major veterans organizations. The panel also should determine eligibility for burial in such cemeteries—a matter which up to now has been largely left to the judgment of military officials.

In the meantime, I fully support the temporary reprieve for Fort Rosecrans which H.R. 9481 would provide.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas have any further requests for time?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk now read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Adair	Ayres	Barrett
Anderson, Ill.	Baring	Battin

Belcher	Ford,	Minshall, Ohio
Berry	William D.	Mize
Beets	Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Blackburn	Galifianakis	Passman
Blatnik	Gialmo	Pettis
Bolling	Goodell	Pike
Bolton	Griffiths	Pirnie
Bray	Gude, Md.	Pollock
Brock	Gurney	Pool
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	Price, Tex.
Brown, Mich.	Hardy	Railsback
Broyhill, Va.	Harsha	Reifel
Button	Hays	Rhodes, Ariz.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Riegle
Cederberg	Hosmer	Robison
Collier	Howard	Ronan
Conable	Hull	St. Onge
Corman	Jacobs	Schwengel
Cowger	Keith	Selden
Cramer	Kuykendall	Shipley
Culver	Lipscomb	Skubitz
Davis, Wis.	Lukens	Smith, N.Y.
Derwinski	McCulloch	Steiger, Wis.
Dickinson	McDonald,	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Mich.	Utt, Calif.
Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Esch	MacGregor	Watts
Eshleman	Madden	Wiggins
Everett	Meeds	Williams, Miss.
Ewins, Tenn.	Meskill	Wilson, Bob
Ford, Gerald R.	Miller, Calif.	Younger

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9481, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 334 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", as follows: "Research", \$2,595,000, and "Plant and animal disease and pest control", \$2,077,000.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation and extend my compliments to the Appropriations Committee for the work they have done in connection with this supplemental request. What I have to say is in no sense any criticism of the work and effort that committee has carried on.

I do want to make just a few very brief comments with reference to the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for his kindness in answering questions from time to time that I have asked with reference to some of the programs that fall under the jurisdiction of his subcommittee.

Today, I would like to make some comments particularly with reference to the Farmers Home Administration. Many of us are concerned with the FHA programs, because we feel they have been doing a good job. We all hear a great deal of criticism today, as indicated in some of the earlier debate, from many of our constituents who are concerned with Federal expenditures, and who are desirous of cutbacks in those programs which many people class as give-away or grant-type programs.

First of all, I want to comment on one of these FHA programs—self-help housing, which frankly I feel is meeting a very great need. It is not a giveaway program, as only 4 percent direct loans are available to those willing to help themselves.

The demand for these direct loans has exceeded the amount available; therefore, during February 1967, the Farmers Home Administration had to decide whether it would discontinue making loans to families participating in self-help housing, or meet their credit needs with insured loans. Since the agency had the capacity to meet the credit needs of these families with insured loans, it decided to do so. This has created a hardship for these families because the interest rate on insured loans is 5 percent. This difference of 1 percent may appear small, but it actually rules out a substantial number of those individuals now eligible. Because, as you are aware, eligibility is determined by this group's ability to repay as the floor, and their maximum income as the ceiling.

The people in this category who are in the rural areas of our country have some very serious problems particularly in connection with their need for better housing. I believe we all recognize it. It has always been my contention that if there could be a way found whereby the individual would have some of his own work, his own effort, and his own initiative in a home, he would tend to take care of it, protect it, and keep it painted and cleaned up in a way which I believe we all feel a home should be.

Unfortunately, many of our programs are in the category of what some people refer to as handout or giveaway programs. We have seen some of our public housing wrecked and destroyed apparently because of lack of any particular interest or concern on the part of the occupant.

My own particular experience with the self-help housing program, as it operates in California, has been one of creating a very favorable climate, because the people who are finally approved for loans in this program are investigated carefully, and they have to meet very narrow and rigid qualifications. Also, they have to indicate real initiative.

They put a great deal of their own effort, initiative, and motivation into these homes, before they are placed in the position of moving in.

I feel that under this program a great many low-income people could be given better and improved housing. It represents a step out of poverty, while at the same time providing an inspiration to these people to develop self-dependence and a willingness to do those things necessary to lift themselves above the poverty level.

I would urge, and I express the hope that the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the subcommittee of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], in consideration of the regular appropriation, will give real consideration to some increase in the appropriations for this program. I am informed that an additional \$2.5 million is needed for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude by commending the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee for discretion in keeping the appropriations for this program quite small to start with, because this was an innovation. Frankly, because the funds provided were limited, a great deal of care has been used in the selection of areas as well as the selection of people who would qualify under this program.

There has been a great deal of care and a great deal of interest by many very responsible people in seeing to it that this program got off to a good start and that it did not get involved, as some people would say, in some of the giveaway programs.

In my own particular area—and, as is true of all, we have a little self-interest in our own districts—there is a large population of Mexican-American people who have been making a great deal of use of this program. It has done much for these people, giving them good, improved, clean housing, and they have pride in that housing, compared to the old type of so-called public housing. The progress is really outstanding, and this is an example of what happens when the individual has a direct interest and concern in some of his own labor and in his home. I hope we can continue to make this program really work.

I might point out also, Mr. Chairman, that the need for additional direct rural housing funds to repair or replace buildings lost or damaged as a result of a natural disaster has become critical. I am informed that as a result of the tornado last weekend in Minnesota and by earlier windstorms in Illinois and Iowa, that there is a need of an additional \$2 million.

Direct loan assistance to other low-income families also had to be discontinued when the available funds were committed. This includes the elderly families whose incomes are so low that they need a cosigner to make their payments on the loan. In order to meet the urgent credit needs of these people an additional \$3 million is needed for the remainder of this fiscal year.

In conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views on these matters, and I hope the committee and my colleagues will give them every consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR THE
HANDICAPPED

For an additional amount for "Educational improvement for the handicapped", for planning grants to States under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 871-880), and not to exceed \$50,000 for salaries and expenses in connection therewith, \$2,475,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be allotted in such equitable manner as the Commissioner of Education may determine, but the allotments for each of the States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia

shall not be less than \$20,000, and the allotments for each of the territories of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be not less than \$10,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ST GERMAIN

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ST GERMAIN: On page 12, after line 6 insert the following:

"PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

"For an additional amount for 'Payments to school districts, \$20,000,000.

"ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Assistance for school construction', \$48,000,000."

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, in 1950, after its Education and Labor Committees held hearings throughout the Nation, the Congress recognized its responsibility to communities where its activities imposed special burdens on local schools and enacted Public Laws 874 and 815. These now famous laws provide financial assistance for maintenance and operation and assistance to construct facilities needed because of Federal impact.

The rationale of this legislation is that while the Federal activities create additional school enrollments, Federal properties do not contribute property tax revenues. Thus Public Laws 874 and 815 were designed for the Federal Government to accept the responsibility of the normal citizen in a community.

We have a definite obligation, Mr. Chairman, to the impacted communities. We should and must live up to our responsibility by providing to these communities the funds to which they are entitled.

Last year an attempt was made to reduce allocations to impacted communities by 12 percent. Fortunately, through the vigorous leadership of my friend and colleague, the beloved late John E. Fogarty, the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee restored these funds in a supplemental appropriations bill which was later approved by the House.

Much to everyone's dismay, John Fogarty is not with us today and neither are the necessary funds to fully compensate the impacted communities for the burden placed on them by the presence of Federal installations.

Frankly, I am greatly disturbed to see so much money expended by this Government to help other nations and yet, in a matter as crucial as education and one in which a heavy burden is placed upon local school districts by the impact of Federal activities, we fail to appropriate sufficient funds to meet the demands of impacted areas.

Why, Mr. Chairman, do we persist in our attempt to deprive impacted communities of funds necessary to meet the cost of educating children whose parents live and/or work in Federal installations?

We must live up to this commitment and to the intent of Public Laws 874 and 815.

Appropriations for 1967 are \$48 million less than what is needed to meet entitlements under Public Law 815. With respect to Public Law 874, we have failed

to appropriate \$20 million needed to meet entitlements under that legislation.

That simply means that a multitude of school districts across the Nation will not receive what is due to them under Public Laws 874 and 815 which, I would like to mention again, were designed to relieve the burden placed upon local school districts by the presence of Federal activities.

In the State of Rhode Island, it means that the city of Providence will have to do without \$150,000 for maintenance and operation under Public Law 874 and that North Kingstown and Tiverton will not get the \$589,000 and \$117,000 respectively for construction purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we have a definite commitment to the impacted areas which must be met.

Therefore, I would now like to offer an amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967 which would provide an additional \$48 million needed under Public Law 815 and an additional \$20 million needed for Public Law 874.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend is with me and I am with him on the many amendments which have been presented here in the House of Representatives and under different colors and a different war and a different day, I would probably be with him.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a supplemental bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my distinguished friend realizes that by the time this bill passes the Congress and reaches the President of the United States, it will be far, far late in the fiscal year. My friend is speaking in a nice, round, fat number of \$68,000,000. It so happens that from the \$416.2 million in the 1967 bill \$9 million is being held in reserve because the Office of Education missed in their estimate that this would be required for New York and Houston. If and when that is released, the latest estimate we have is that they will have sufficient funds to pay all entitlements except to those large cities and some others that did not qualify until the amendments that became law last November, well after their school budgets were set up.

Mr. Chairman, under this new legislation the large cities would qualify for the amount of \$17 million and some other school systems for the amount of \$3 million, except for the action of the Congress, Mr. Chairman, in placing a restricting amendment in the 1967 appropriation bill which prevented these applications from being funded in 1967. Mr. Chairman, one must realize that these school districts had set up their budget months before these amendments were enacted.

Most of you have represented school districts—I have. But, now, when the school year is almost over to suggest that you give them, to their utter amazement, a \$17 million and \$3 million windfall, which they really cannot use for the current year's expenses I do not think is right.

Mr. Chairman, under Public Law 815 the gentleman's amendment would add the sum of \$48 million and those would carry over to 1968 if the estimates of the Department are right. You will find about \$17 million are available now, and because the terminal date for the filing of applications was so late this year—February 20—they are not going to finally approve and fund enough applications to use all of these funds by the end of the fiscal year. In a letter dated yesterday the Department estimated they will have \$6 million unobligated on June 30, 1967.

Mr. Chairman, these districts have hundreds of applications filed. There is no question about that. And by the end of next fiscal year you will probably be short of funds to the extent, likely, of \$50 million if we do not appropriate more than is in the budget for 1968. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has completed its hearings on the regular bill. I would not be at liberty to divulge what the subcommittee's recommendation will be, even if we had met to make such decisions, which we have not, but I can suggest to the chairman and to my friend, knowing the concern of this House on this very delicate problem, he should not be unduly alarmed. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, for this purpose, for the purpose of this supplemental bill, this is the wrong time and the wrong place.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course I will yield.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. There is always a question—and I have to disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the time and place being wrong, because the amounts that I use and have in my amendment, according to the information I received, are on applications that came in that were timely, and that have been approved. Our big problem is which communities are we going to cut out?

Mr. FLOOD. Let me say this to the gentleman: that by law applications that are filed in 1 year and eligible and approved must be the first applications that are funded under the next appropriation bill.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The next appropriation bill is short another \$50 million already, the gentleman knows that, and I am at liberty to say it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Rhode Island, my distinguished friend, will withdraw this amendment from consideration at this time.

I do not believe this is the proper time to consider this amendment. We have asked the administration to send an estimate as to what would be needed in order to fully fund the applications under these two public laws, and as of this time—and I have here a letter in my hand from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated yesterday—we are unable to come up with any estimate from the executive branch of the Government in regard to any shortage of funds for this fiscal year, except

for those covered by the amendments that became law last November, and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania put it, a supplemental appropriation for them would be a windfall.

This matter is under active consideration in the executive branch of the Government. I believe that an estimate will be forthcoming by the time this bill is considered in the other body, if it appears that any other shortage exists. I believe it could very well prejudice this case to have action today.

We went into this in some detail. It is true that these two public laws are funded at the level of 90 percent, or less, for fiscal 1968—that is in the President's budget, which we have not acted on yet. I would assure the gentleman that as one member serving on this committee for a good many years, ever since this department was created, we have never shortchanged these school districts on any funds that they had good reason to anticipate because of legislation on the books before they made up their school budgets.

I can also assure the gentleman the same thing will happen this year. No school district in that category will be shortchanged by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentleman would withhold his amendment with that assurance.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The figures I inserted in the amendment I received from the Department late yesterday afternoon. In addition to that, I received word there were three communities in Rhode Island. I did not follow up on them because I did not have time to compile the figures on all the communities.

Mr. LAIRD. I have the communities listed here, and the estimates that have been given. I assume it is the same list because we also received it late yesterday.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. They were \$48 million and \$20 million.

The gentleman asked to defer action until the bill goes to the Senate. By the same token, I believe the House is very competent, and if and when the bill goes to the Senate, they can change it if they find these amounts are too heavy and too high.

Mr. LAIRD. I would say to the gentleman that the amounts in his amendment would provide for those covered in the November amendments to Public Law 874 and funds that the Office of Education would not use until next fiscal year under Public Law 815. I support the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I certainly wish to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his statement and assurance that he will see to it that we fulfill our obligations under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 this year by adding in the Senate and in conference once accurate figures are in. And most important his pledge that the necessary funds will be included in the next appropriation bill for Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 in fiscal 1968.

However, on the basis of all the infor-

mation I have now, this money is needed this year and I trust my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 12, after line 6, insert the following:

"GRANTS FOR ADULT EDUCATION

"For an additional amount for carrying out the Adult Education Act of 1966, as authorized by Public Law 89-750, \$10,000,000".

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1966 we enacted the adult education act and authorized \$40 million for the fiscal year 1967. Unfortunately, only \$30 million out of the \$40 million was appropriated.

The amendment which I have offered and which is now before us would restore the cut by appropriating an additional \$10 million for the fiscal year 1967. It is similar to H.R. 4779 which I introduced on February 2, 1967.

The adult education program has proven its value—with over 500,000 adults benefiting from the program in all 50 States. The response from the States and in the communities has been an enthusiastic one. The money has been more than well spent. In fact, what better investment can we make than in upgrading education?

Adult basic education teaches those who did not graduate from the eighth grade to read and write. It enables them to get better jobs and to have a greater chance in life.

The money spent on this worthwhile program will be returned to us in value many times over.

The New York Times stated:

For those who cannot read and write, the promise of literacy represents a negotiable share in the affluent society—not just a promissory note to the dream of a Great one.

For many, however, their opportunity to have a share of the affluent society has been curtailed—it was curtailed by the cutting of this authorization to \$30 million last year. The shortchanging of the program has produced severe cutbacks.

This important program began late in 1965, and as a result, many States were not able to use their full 1965 allotment. Therefore, in some cases, a substantial remainder was carried over and used during 1966 in addition to the 1966 allotment. Moreover, during 1966 several upward adjustments were made in the allotments to some States through the redistribution of unused funds.

Thus, the amount of money available for the adult education program during fiscal year 1966 was greater in some States than the amount which otherwise would have been the State's share of the adult basic education funds for that year.

To give a brief example of how this has worked—in New York State—there was the following sequence of events:

New York State's original allotment

for fiscal year 1966 was \$1,290,000. In February the Office of Education allotted New York State an additional \$1,290,004 out of released funds. In June it again allotted an additional \$250,000. This made a total adjusted allotment of \$2,540,004 for fiscal year 1966. In addition, New York State had the remaining unused portion of its 1965 funds which amounted to \$868,057. The total of real funds available to New York State in fiscal year 1966 then amounted to \$3,698,061.

On the basis of this assistance, New York was making real progress in the attack on illiteracy among its adult citizens.

Now under the cutback for the fiscal year 1967, the amount for New York is \$2,415,744 which is \$1,282,317 less than the real amount received and used in the previous fiscal year, that is the fiscal year 1966. So New York cannot sustain the program at the level to which it has already grown.

As a result, classes have been suspended and students have been turned away. Teachers, many of whom were specially trained, have been dismissed and have not been paid.

Carefully made plans have been cast aside and, above all, once again the hopes of many people have been dashed.

People do not understand the administrative reasons for this curtailment. They only see the cutbacks; they see the reductions, and their disappointment is keen, and resentment that some hold is understandable.

I recognize that the program, if we adopt my amendment, will operate only 2 more months. Nevertheless, this supplemental appropriation now would enable it to continue, and when the fiscal 1968 appropriation is approved, it will be able to expand as it should.

The adult basic education program offers hope to the hopeless. It rehabilitates a sizable number of American citizens who by increased earning power will pay back the Government many times over.

Mr. Chairman, we are constantly investing billions of dollars in military programs and in space programs. Only this morning the House Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended the start of a program which will cost us \$2 billion over the next 10 years for the development of space hardware. It seems to me that we must assess our priorities. It is not asking too much to invest the \$10 million in this program, which was authorized, but not appropriated, last year. We must look at this question as an investment in human renewal if we are going to really meet our needs in this country.

I hope that this amendment will be approved. I believe it is important. I stress again the fact that programs already underway have been cut back because of a lack of funds and will be cut back further unless this money is appropriated to meet the authorization which was included in the law last year.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. As the gentleman from New York knows well, I am distressed to be in this position where I must oppose an amendment with merit, except for the timing. I have admired the great courage and integrity of the gentleman

since he came to this House. So, I repeat, I am distressed at this moment to have to say this to you, Mr. Chairman.

In the 1967 bill the complete budget request of \$30 million was voted by the Congress. The gentleman now asks for another \$10 million. That amount has not been requested by the executive branch. It is not in the budget. This \$10 million is one-third in addition to what the Congress voted for 1967, the full budget request. I repeat, it is one-third, \$10 million, in addition.

Contrasted with that only about one-tenth of the year in which these funds would be spent will remain after this bill becomes law. I think that makes the situation very clear.

This is a program with great merit, as the gentleman has stated, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that despite my feelings for my friend, this is not the proper time, on a supplemental bill, for this kind of amendment, and I suggest that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VIII
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
FAMILY HOUSING

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For the Homeowners Assistance Fund, established pursuant to section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754, approved November 3, 1966), \$5,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 1216, Ninetieth Congress, or similar legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order asking the Chair to strike chapter 8 of the second supplemental appropriation bill, to be found on page 17, lines 6 through 16 thereof, for the reason there has been no authorization of this appropriation and that it is contrary to rule XXI (2) of this body. Consideration of S. 1216 is now before this body's Committee on Rules, it is controversial, it has mixed jurisdictional parentage, and it came out of the Committee on Armed Services with eight or more opposing votes. It can be defeated on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida seek to be heard on this point of order?

Mr. SIKES. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as the bill states and as the report states, there is a requirement for the enactment of authorizing legislation. The bill which is before the House clearly requires that appropriations for the acquisition of properties must be authorized by a military construction authorization act, and that no moneys in the fund may be used except as may be provided in an appropriation act, and it would clearly protect the Congress and fulfill the requirements of the law.

What we are seeking to do is to put into operation an immediate program.

If we do not provide funds now for people who need money for losses in their property as a result of base closures, it is going to be some months before it can be done, probably, in the regular appropriation bill.

Of course, the language is subject to a point of order. We concede that. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, that is the story, but the homeowners will be the ones who suffer unnecessarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. As the gentleman from Florida has conceded, the language objected to by the gentleman from Missouri is subject to a point of order in that no authorization has been enacted into law. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER X
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$3,900,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 18, after line 17, insert the following: "No funds appropriated by this act shall be used to pay salaries or expenses in connection with the consummation of a treaty on nuclear proliferation."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to use the power of the purse to make a bit of foreign policy, one which I feel is most urgently needed at this time.

What will the amendment do? It will withhold the use of any appropriation for salaries from the act of completing negotiations on a Treaty on Nuclear Proliferation between the enactment of this bill and July 1.

It is well to bear in mind the limited duration of the amendment's effect.

As background, I am sure the Members are aware that at Geneva negotiations have been proceeding off and on in regard to a Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. At the present time negotiations are in recess. During this recess period, our administration has been applying heavy pressure upon our allies in NATO to get acceptance of the treaty. It is very plain that the effort has been only partially successful.

To illustrate, German concern continues, yet our Government has given no promise to Germany that we will not sign a treaty against German wishes.

I recall that about 2 years ago a Telstar debate occurred in which the junior Senator from New York, Mr. KENNEDY, participated, and Franz Josef Strauss spoke for West Germany. Mr. Strauss raised a very searching and fundamental question at that time which is still appropriate in connection with the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. He said, "Which comes first, NATO or Geneva?" That is, on which do we place the highest priority? Is it the viability, the strength, the unity of the family of NATO nations which have worked together for military

defense purposes all these years? Is that our top priority? Or is our highest priority, instead, even at the expense of NATO, what amounts to a bilateral deal with the Soviet Union which would have the effect of bargaining away for an indefinite period legitimate rights of our valued allies, including Germany.

To me the answer to Mr. Strauss' rhetorical question is very easy. Of course we want to halt proliferation of weapons. We should do what we can to that end. But we have to rate our priorities. In my view, the very highest priority must always be given to strength within the Western alliance; that is, NATO.

It is very clear to anyone who has studied this subject that West Germany in particular is quite concerned about how the treaty will affect that nation in the future, and not only in regard to military affairs. Germany is exposed to the tremendous military power brought along the frontier by the Soviet Union. It is concerned about that threat, of course, but also it is a nation of great competence and technology, a nation which actually fathered the technology which resulted in nuclear affairs.

Can we reasonably expect a people with that competence, with that progressive instinct and with that desire to move ahead, to foreclose forevermore participation in this most essential technology?

I do not believe we wisely can. I do not believe that even this treaty would accomplish that or be very effective in foreclosing nuclear proliferation elsewhere.

But if we should give a higher priority to the consummation of this treaty on nuclear weapons, and by doing that cause concern and perhaps resentment within the German nation or within the Italian nation or other NATO nations, I might add, it would be at too great a cost.

For that reason I ask support for this amendment, which would give us an additional 3 months to explore fully in the public arena and in this Congress, all the matters involved, and would also enable other interested parties to explore fully the very complicated and the very vexing questions which arise in connection with this treaty.

I hope there will be broad support for this proposal. This is an effort to make foreign policy. I am sure those of us who have the feeling that we should uphold constitutional processes recognize the right and responsibility of this House to use its influence on foreign policy.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman, my friend from Illinois, realizes that as recently as April 25, 1967, there was a vote in the other body—and the other body is the body which passes upon international treaties and not this body—there was a vote there of 88 to nothing approving a treaty entitled "Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies," which contained this provision:

Paragraph (1) of Article IV obligates the treaty parties "not to place in orbit around

the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

Now, this action was taken in the other body on April 25, just past. And there was an approval vote of 88 to nothing. We are here and now concerned with an amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois with respect to an amount of money carried in this bill not \$1 of which has a thing to do with a treaty of any sort at all.

The amount of money contained in this bill at line 16 on page 8, \$3.9 million, is made up of \$3 million in increased pay costs as the result of the pay increases voted by the Congress last year for Federal employees. The remaining \$900,000 is for use in three countries in Southeast Asia, to wit, Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. It is in those unsettled countries that we are adding the additional employees for the Foreign Service—and I will frankly use the word—to "beef them up" in this critical area of the world to the extent of 70 American and local employees. There is also included in this \$900,000 moneys for standby generators that are vitally necessary out there.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Thank you for yielding. You are not under the impression that my item would seek to strike this item? Its only effect would be to withhold the money—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman at the outset of his remarks said he was going to use the power of the purse to make foreign policy.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are in awful shape if that is the way we are going to run this Government and this Congress. Under the Constitution of the United States, the matter of foreign policy, when it comes to a treaty, is peculiarly only within the hands of the other body and not this body.

Mr. FINDLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am sure he will acknowledge that if we wait until the Senate approved a treaty to which the President has already pledged the prestige of his office—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They have already passed the treaty that I have described by a vote of 88 to nothing, which does the opposite of the thing that the gentleman is trying to do with this hamstringing amendment. The other body passed it by a vote of 88 to nothing. Not even a Republican in the other body voted against it.

Mr. FINDLEY. What did that treaty have to do with the proliferation of nuclear weapons?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have already read to you what it had to do with nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and gave you the section and paragraph. If you do not understand this, I am sorry,

but the main point is that this is no way to consider an appropriation bill. This supplemental bill carries vitally needed money that the gentleman's amendment seeks to restrict, all of which is for Southeast Asia and for increased pay costs. These increased pay costs are mandatory. If they are not paid, any employee of the State Department can go to the Court of Claims and get his money that way, because the increased pay has to be paid.

Mr. FINDLEY. But this amendment, if adopted, would encumber that pay going only for an unwise purpose.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Actually, this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois is futile. It is an exercise in frustration. But I am thoroughly opposing it for the reason that it represents an improper manner in which to do business here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee held hearings on this matter and on this item, and we know exactly what it means. Apparently the gentleman from Illinois does not know what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], which amendment has nothing in the world to do with the space treaty which has already been negotiated and confirmed by the other body, but which applies to the underway negotiations of a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. We therefore look to a treaty under negotiation.

It is said that there is nothing as powerful as an idea whose time has come.

It also should be said that there is nothing as dangerous as an idea whose time is passed.

When the United States possessed its nuclear monopoly two decades ago the idea of nuclear nonproliferation was a powerful one. It became embedded in our national policy where it remains today. Despite the withering of the monopoly, despite changes in all parts of the world during these past 20 years, we still cling to the fictions that the spread of nuclear weapons can be stopped and that a nonproliferation policy still serves the national security interests of the United States.

Perhaps these are not fictions, although some respectable and thoughtful people think so. Whether they are or not is basic to the future survival of the United States. Yet we are rushing headlong into a nuclear nonproliferation treaty without any real and intelligent examination of the proposition that it may be the worst possible course for the country. We are doing so without examination or public discussion of alternatives to nonproliferation under today's circumstances of the world and those projected for tomorrow and beyond.

That discussion, and the evaluation of alternatives which it involves, must occur before we recklessly pursue just one single alternative in the Johnson administration's haste to negotiate a nonproliferation treaty for treaty's sake.

Secretary McNamara has established in the Defense Department the technique of systems analysis by which national defense problems before the Department are minutely analyzed. Every possible alternative solution is evaluated to determine the one which is most effective for the United States. Yet, no analysis whatever has been made in connection with the vital problem of what, in the security interest of the United States, is the best alternative policy on the spread of nuclear weapons to select from a wide spectrum of alternatives ranging from absolute nonproliferation to total and complete accelerated proliferation.

We have maintained a hypnotic focus on one alternative only. It is an alternative at one extreme end of the spectrum, namely no proliferation at all. This is despite the fact that the policy has failed not once but four times already. First with the British, second with the Soviets, third with the French, and fourth with the Red Chinese.

Before we paint ourselves into a corner for the indefinite future by signing a nonproliferation treaty, good sense and sound defense planning requires at least a look along the spectrum at all the alternatives. The Johnson administration completely ignores this wise course. It rushes for a treaty, making the most extravagant and dangerous concessions along the way. Again and again I have asked the Disarmament Agency to make studies of the alternatives to the nonproliferation monomania. It refuses to do so. Secretary McNamara has even prevented such studies from being made by the Defense Department.

For example, the policy of selective transfer or sharing of nuclear weapons technology, a sensitive issue, but an increasingly important alternative, is a case in point. In April 1965, the Army Research Office released a formal request for a proposal entitled "Selective Nuclear Transfer," designated to be a study of "the feasibility and desirability, in the 1970 time frame, of providing selected U.S. allies a significant nuclear defense capability without the necessity for maintaining U.S. control or custody over weapons systems of their employment." Within 2 months thereafter the contractors who submitted proposals were notified that "it was determined to be in the best interest of the Government to cancel the project as presently proposed." It was suggested that Department of Defense would rewrite the work statement, "assume overall responsibility for the project," and resubmit it, but nothing since has been heard of the study.

Indeed, such a study is very vital. Contract studies have been made which indicate the feasibility of inserting in nuclear warheads what I choose to call "controlled action plugs." These CAPS would, for instance, limit the use of a nuclear warhead to purely defensive purposes. The warhead could not fire except in a defensive envelope over the allied territory involved if fitted to an antiballistics missile defense rocket. It would not fire at all if removed from the rocket.

With ever widening worldwide defense responsibilities it may become quite important in the near future that United States manufacture and supply under

strict CAP controls ABM warheads, to certain allied nations for strictly defense purposes, as an alternative to U.S. loss of strategic control and influence in vital areas of the globe.

Such a system might even prevent uncontrolled and indiscriminate proliferation of nuclear weapons on a national basis. India, as an example, with nuclear-armed Red China on its borders might, with the availability of such a defense system, forgo acquisition of nuclear capabilities on its own.

The foregoing merely hints at circumstances in which controlled and selective proliferation might better serve U.S. interests than a nonproliferation treaty which would absolutely bar the United States from selecting such an alternative, no matter how important it might become to our own national security.

I rise in support of the amendment before us in an effort to slow down this plunge into a treaty and to plead for proper U.S. evaluation of alternatives before we chance freezing ourselves into a posture which could lead to great danger.

The only purpose of a treaty such as the nonproliferation treaty is to create a situation of less danger after its signing than before. Before signing we should be sure that it would decrease dangers, not increase them. We should not sign blindly, without first determining with positive assurance that less, not more, risks will ensue.

It is time the people in our State Department and at the Disarmament Agency be put on a rein, be made to do their homework, be required to prove that the courses they take are wise, and be made to determine with intelligence the actual best course for the United States. Otherwise we risk signing away our future capability to defend ourselves and to maintain our independence.

Our world stands no risk of nuclear holocaust from the delay involved in so doing. Rather, the delay may avoid such an actual risk if it is used intelligently to think out the maximum policy of assurance to the peace of the world and the security of our country, which two goals are inexorably intertwined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOSMER was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to yield to the gentlemen who were standing.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Illinois, who has offered this amendment, I find myself in strong opposition. There was no subject that I was aware of that President Eisenhower was more concerned with than nonproliferation. He felt very strongly we must make progress in this area if the world was to move meaningfully toward peace. I believe he still does. Obviously we always should consider alternatives but to take

this action in an appropriation bill would be a mistake.

Our Government is presently involved in very delicate and very important negotiations. It would undermine them. I believe that Bill Foster, our Disarmament Director, is one of the ablest Americans we have in this field. He is trying to negotiate safeguards. I believe it would be a serious mistake to preclude any reasonable and sound opportunity to formulate meaningful safeguards so we can proceed to negotiate a sound nuclear nonproliferation treaty. This is important in many parts of the world, including Asia, and Red China, and certainly the Near East. Indeed this treaty should be a matter of highest national priority. Should negotiations falter and prospects for a treaty darken we could see a world in a few years where perhaps some 10 to 15 nations could be atomic powers. This would be an uncertain world and not the best legacy to leave our children.

I would merely ask the gentleman whether he wants to cut off a thoughtful continuation of negotiations looking towards a sound nonproliferation treaty?

Mr. HOSMER. I would answer the gentleman by saying in the first place my whole thesis was dedicated to the proposition that this is not a thoughtful negotiation, that the United States has recklessly gone into a nonproliferation kick without any attempt whatsoever to evaluate the alternatives, and discover if any of them offer a better position for the protection of our country.

I will also say to the gentleman when former President Eisenhower became President, there were only three nuclear powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. France did not attain nuclear power until the tail-end of the Eisenhower administration in 1960, and Red China did not attain it until 1963.

I submit that later developments have outmoded our policy of nonproliferation, and it is up to us as courageous Americans to face up to the facts as they are, and not as we would wish they would be, and face up to a world in which there is proliferation. We cannot rationally, and should not quixotically involve ourselves in trying to stop the progress of technology, which no one has been able to accomplish. They could not stop the invention of the wheel, they could not stop the advancement of knowledge in the Dark Ages, and they cannot stop proliferation in the last half of this century in which we live. So in order to protect us we had best do the things that are necessary to see that when it does get into other hands it gets into sensible hands.

It is necessary to see that it gets into hands under which circumstances impose controls in order that nuclear aggression can be forestalled, if, indeed, it is at all possible to forestall it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I had planned to take a little time on this on my own, but I will try to discuss this in this colloquy with the gentleman.

I do not want to get into any argument

as to whether we ought to have a proliferation treaty or not. But I do not think it makes much difference whether this amendment is passed or it is not passed.

It will not accomplish what the gentleman from Illinois intends it to accomplish, if I understand it correctly.

Mr. HOSMER. I suppose that is right, because in these matters the State Department, like the Defense Department, gets into discussions with the Congress and gets some advice from the Congress and then goes out and does exactly what it wants to do anyway.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think it is fine to carry on this foreign policy discussion. However, this amendment will not accomplish what the gentleman from Illinois intends.

That is all I have to say. I have no argument with the gentleman's position one way or the other, but so far as this amendment on this appropriation bill is concerned, I just do not think it will work.

Mr. HOSMER. I understand all it will do is to cut off the amount of pay raise and to personnel assigned to the non-proliferation treaty negotiations.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does not the gentleman from California understand that this is not only an idle gesture but a dangerous gesture as well that would, if successful, set a precedent for interfering in responsibilities of the other body. There is not one dollar in these funds that has the slightest thing to do with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say to the gentleman, I yielded to him when I had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$3,700,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF
NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which has been approved by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY of New York: On page 20, line 4, strike out "\$3,700,000" and insert "\$3,420,000".

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment endorsed by both sides of the subcommittee dealing with this particular Agency and it would reduce the amount in the printed bill by \$280,000 and bring it down to \$3,420,000.

The budget estimate for this item as contained in House Document No. 83 was for \$4,700,000. In testimony before the subcommittee on Friday, April 7, 1967, the witness for this Agency agreed that

the request could be reduced by \$940,000 to a new total of \$3,800,000. This was based on the assumption that the bill would be approved by May 1.

Realizing that the bill would not become law by May 1, the committee reduced the request by an additional \$100,000 and recommended \$3,700,000.

On Friday last, the same day that this bill was reported, a budget revision was submitted to the other body in which this Agency and the Bureau of the Budget now say that their request is to be changed to \$3,620,000.

So we have a situation where they originally requested \$4,740,000. On April 7, 1967, they agreed to a reduction of \$940,000 or a total of \$3,800,000.

On Friday, April 28, the request was again revised by the Agency and/or the Bureau of the Budget to \$3,620,000.

Inasmuch as they have now changed their request at least three times, we feel that we should change our recommendation as well and therefore are recommending the new figure of \$3,420,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment. It is a good amendment. We are reducing the amount to be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT
ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$1,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire as to the total amount that we are spending each year to maintain the Bureau of Public Debt. If anyone has that figure at hand I would like to have it. Apparently it is going up all the time as the debt goes up.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I am advised that it is approximately \$50 million.

Mr. GROSS. Fifty to fifty-four million dollars?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. When the gentleman from Ohio and I came to Congress some years ago, if I remember correctly, the amount was around \$20 million to \$25 million. Now the Bureau of the Public Debt is costing over \$50 million a year and this is another \$2 million supplemental for that purpose.

I hope that it comes through clearly to some people around here that this is just another expenditure to administer the huge debt that we have—\$336 billion, or approximately that.

I remember a few days ago when Secretary of Defense McNamara, in response to a question before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said he hoped that Congress had advanced beyond the stage where it believes it is necessary to retire the Federal debt. Can it be that Mr.

McNamara is right that Congress does not care about the huge Federal debt, whether there is any retirement of it?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa must recognize that the debt continues to grow and grow and grow. It takes that additional personnel to figure out the huge interest that we pay.

Mr. GROSS. My friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], has offered the best explanation yet for this supplemental appropriation to the Bureau of the Public Debt.

While I have the floor and a little time remaining, I would like to ask a question concerning the next item, which is the U.S. Secret Service, and the \$1,003,000 of supplemental funds for that Service. It is my understanding that the original request was for some \$500,000, and I wonder if someone can tell me why that amount has been nearly doubled. Silence indicates that apparently no one knows why it has been increased by nearly 100 percent.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman will be patient, he has asked the best question of the afternoon and I am sure the answer will be forthcoming.

Mr. GROSS. You know, those of you who voted for so-called daylight saving time borrowed an hour out of my life last Sunday. I will have to live until next fall to recapture that hour. I do not think I can waste any more time waiting for the answer to my question. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to give the gentleman some of my time for I have trouble using all of it.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to refer him to page 473 of the hearings which rather clearly sets out the facts in connection with this requirement. While it is true that the January budget did carry an estimate of \$545,000 for the Secret Service, other requirements have since developed which could not be accurately forecast at that time. This includes items such as increased Presidential travel and moving costs pursuant to legislation enacted last session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payments of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and the United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 109, Ninetieth Congress, \$10,978,173, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever ap-

proprated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk proceeded to read the bill. Mr. MAHON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the bill deals with pay increases heretofore provided by Congress. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the remainder of the bill be open for amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of the bill?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 391, nays 6, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]
YEAS—391

Abblitt	Battin	Brown, Mich.
Abernethy	Belcher	Brown, Ohio
Adair	Bell	Broyhill, N.C.
Adams	Bennett	Broyhill, Va.
Addabbo	Berry	Buchanan
Albert	Betts	Burke, Fla.
Anderson, Ill.	Bevill	Burke, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Blester	Burleson
Andrews, Ala.	Bingham	Burton, Calif.
Andrews	Blackburn	Bush
N. Dak.	Blanton	Button
Annunzio	Boggs	Byrne, Pa.
Arends	Boland	Byrnes, Wis.
Ashbrook	Bow	Cabell
Ashley	Brademas	Cahill
Ashmore	Brasco	Carey
Aspinall	Brinkley	Carter
Ayres	Brooks	Casey
Bates	Broomfield	Cederberg
	Brotzman	

Celler	Helstoski	Pelly
Chamberlain	Henderson	Pepper
Clancy	Hicks	Perkins
Clark	Holifield	Pettis
Clausen,	Holland	Philbin
Don H.	Horton	Pickle
Clawson, Del.	Hosmer	Pike
Cleveland	Howard	Pirnie
Coleman	Hull	Poage
Colmer	Hungate	Poff
Conable	Hunt	Pollock
Conte	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Conyers	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Corbett	Irwin	Pryor
Cowger	Jarman	Pucinski
Cramer	Joelson	Purcell
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Quillen
Curtis	Johnson, Pa.	Rallsback
Daddario	Jonas	Randall
Daniels	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Reid, Ill.
Dawson	Jones, N.C.	Reid, N.Y.
de la Garza	Karsten	Reifel
Delaney	Karth	Reinecke
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Resnick
Denney	Kazen	Reuss
Dent	Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.
Derwinski	Kelly	Rhodes, Pa.
Devine	King, Calif.	Riegle
Dingell	King, N.Y.	Rivers
Dole	Kirwan	Roberts
Donohue	Kleppe	Robison
Dorn	Kluczynski	Rodino
Dow	Kornegay	Rogers, Colo.
Dowdy	Kupferman	Rogers, Fla.
Downing	Kuykendall	Rooney, N.Y.
Dulski	Kyl	Rooney, Pa.
Duncan	Kyros	Rosenthal
Dwyer	Laird	Rostenkowski
Eckhardt	Landrum	Roth
Edmondson	Langen	Roudebush
Edwards, Ala.	Latta	Roush
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Roybal
Edwards, La.	Lennon	Rumsfeld
Ellberg	Lipscomb	Ruppe
Erlenborn	Lloyd	Ryan
Esch	Long, La.	St Germain
Eshleman	Long, Md.	Sandman
Evans, Colo.	Lukens	Satterfield
Fallon	McCarthy	Saylor
Farbstien	McClary	Schadeberg
Fascell	McClure	Scherle
Feighan	McCulloch	Schneebell
Findley	McDade	Schweiker
Fino	McDonald,	Schwengel
Fisher	Mich.	Scott
Flood	McFall	Shriver
Flynt	McMillan	Sikes
Foley	Macdonald,	Sisk
Ford, Gerald R.	Mass.	Skubitz
Fountain	MacGregor	Slack
Fraser	Machen	Smith, Calif.
Frelinghuysen	Mahon	Smith, Iowa
Friedel	Mailliard	Smith, N.Y.
Fuqua	Marsh	Smith, Okla.
Gallagher	Martin	Snyder
Gallagher	Mathias, Calif.	Springer
Garmatz	Mathias, Md.	Stafford
Gathings	Matsunaga	Staggers
Gettys	May	Stanton
Gialmo	Mayne	Steed
Gibbons	Meskill	Steiger, Ariz.
Gilbert	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Gonzalez	Miller, Calif.	Stephens
Goodell	Miller, Ohio	Stratton
Gooding	Mills	Stubblefield
Gray	Minish	Stuckey
Green, Oreg.	Mink	Sullivan
Green, Pa.	Minshall	Taft
Griffiths	Mize	Talcott
Grover	Monagan	Taylor
Gubser	Montgomery	Teague, Calif.
Gude	Moore	Teague, Tex.
Gurney	Moorhead	Tenzer
Hagan	Morgan	Thompson, Ga.
Haley	Morris, N. Mex.	Thompson, N.J.
Halleck	Morse, Mass.	Thomson, Wis.
Halpern	Morton	Tiernan
Hamilton	Mosher	Tuck
Hammer-	Moss	Tunney
schmidt	Muiter	Udall
Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Hanna	Myers	Utt
Hansen, Idaho	Natcher	Van Deerlin
Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi	Vanik
Hardy	Neisen	Vigorito
Harrison	Nichols	Waggonner
Harsha	Nix	Waldie
Harvey	O'Hara, Ill.	Walker
Hathaway	O'Hara, Mich.	Wampler
Hawkins	O'Konski	Watkins
Hays	Olsen	Watson
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neal, Ga.	Whalen
Heckler, Mass.	Ottinger	Whalley
	Patman	
	Patten	

White	Wilson,	Wylie
Whitener	Charles H.	Wyman
Whitten	Winn	Yates
Widnall	Wolff	Young
Wiggins	Wright	Zablocki
Williams, Pa.	Wyatt	Zwack
Wilson, Bob	Wylder	

NAYS—6

Brock	Gross	Rarick
Davis, Wis.	Hall	Zion

NOT VOTING—36

Baring	Evins, Tenn.	Passman
Barrett	Ford,	Pool
Blatnik	William D.	Ronan
Bolling	Fulton, Pa.	St. Onge
Bolton	Hébert	Selden
Bray	Herlong	Shipley
Brown, Calif.	Jacobs	Vander Jagt
Collier	Keith	Watts
Corman	McEwen	Williams, Miss.
Culver	Madden	Willis
Dickinson	Meeds	Younger
Diggs	Murphy, N.Y.	
Everett	O'Neill, Mass.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bray.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Watts with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Selden.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Meeds.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Pool.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that chapter VIII of the bill just passed was eliminated from the bill on a point of order, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the subsequent chapter numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the second supplemental appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INTEREST RATES SHOULD BE ROLLED BACK TO AVOID ANOTHER FEDERAL RESERVE DEPRESSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we do not need another manmade depression.

The Federal Reserve is dragging its feet and is not doing what is necessary to roll back interest rates to the levels existing before December 6, 1965. The Federal Reserve, unless it changes its ways quickly, may create a full-blown recession in the midst of a wartime economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve, amid much fanfare, lowered the discount rate from 4½ percent to 4 percent on April 6. This lulled many people into thinking that interest rates would come down across the board, but these hopes have proven false. The Federal Reserve has allowed a few interest rates to inch downward, but it is delaying an across-the-board rollback to levels existing before the 1965 increases.

The Federal Reserve's postponement of a full rollback is creating a "wait and see" attitude in much of the economy. Many are waiting to see what will happen to interest rates before they invest their money. This is creating a dangerously unstable condition in the economy.

The housing industry, and the construction business generally, are still lagging badly as the country waits for the results of the foot-dragging policies of the Federal Reserve. This is delaying a return to normal, stable, and reasonable interest rates and is creating the danger of recession throughout the economy.

We need stable and reasonable interest rates now—not some distant day in the future. The rollback should be immediate.

As a first step, I urge the Federal Reserve to lower the interest rate that banks may pay on time deposits. On December 6, 1965, the Federal Reserve raised the interest rate on time deposits—regulation Q—to 5½ percent—a 37½-percent increase. This was one of the principal causes of the high interest, tight money policy which plagued the Nation throughout 1966.

This interest rate should be rolled back to the December 1965 levels. This would mean that banks could pay no more than 4 percent on time deposits of 30 to 90 days and 4½ percent on time deposits of 90 days or more.

As long as the Federal Reserve pegs regulation Q at its current record level, the temptation will be strong for the banks to keep interest rates high. With regulation Q at 5½ percent, the temptation is strong for another round of costly, unnecessary, and wasteful interest rate wars among financial institutions. If the Federal Reserve is sincere about its desires to bring about a rollback of interest rates to the 1965 levels, then regulation Q must be lowered.

Mr. Speaker, I also urge that other steps be taken to assure lower interest rates throughout the economy. In particular, the interest rates on FHA- and VA-insured mortgages should be lowered without delay.

During 1966, FHA was forced to raise interest rates from 5½ percent to 6 percent—the statutory maximum. During this period, VA-insured mortgages in-

creased from 5¼ percent to 6 percent, also the statutory ceiling.

Now that there has been an easing in the money markets, there is no reason for FHA and VA to maintain these extremely high rates. Lowering of these interest rates would help millions of homebuyers and would stimulate the housing industry.

During 1966, housing starts slumped more than 20 percent due to high interest rates and we should do everything possible to reverse this trend in the current year. A rollback in the VA and FHA rates to the December 1965 levels is a necessary beginning and one which should be taken without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, despite the slightly easier conditions and the slightly lower interest rates of recent weeks, we must do more to bring about truly normal conditions in the money markets. We have not yet reversed the trend of high interest rates.

We must demand that the Federal Reserve roll back regulation Q to the levels existing before December 1965. We must also demand a rollback in the FHA and VA rates.

Mr. Speaker, two articles in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, May 2, illustrate the unstable conditions in the money markets and plainly show that the Federal Reserve is not keeping its promises to lower interest rates. These two articles show that the interest rates on certificates of deposit are on their way up again as well as the interest rates on short-term Treasury bills. Most important, the facts contained in these Wall Street Journal stories point to the need for stable interest rates. They point to a need for an immediate rollback of interest rates to a reasonable level—the level existing before December 1965.

This rollback should be accomplished with a single stroke of the pen and not through the inch-by-inch, stop-and-go tactics employed so far by the Federal Reserve. Only a full, concrete rollback will put the economy on a firm footing and let everyone know where we stand on interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place the two articles in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1967]
YIELDS ON TREASURY'S SHORT-TERM BILLS RISE AS DEMAND IS DIVERTED

WASHINGTON.—Yields on the Treasury's latest issues of short-term bills rose as investors started diverting funds into the Treasury's higher-yielding new notes.

The average interest rate on the latest 13-week bill issue rose to 3.770% from 3.715% the week before, but remained well below the 3.905% of the auction two weeks before.

The return to investors on the companion issue of 26-week bills, rose to 3.907% from 3.772% the week before, but remained below the 3.950% of the auction two weeks before.

Dealers in New York attributed the declining demand and thus rising yields on the new bills partly to the effect of the Treasury's refunding operation for which books are open from Monday this week through tomorrow. The 15-month 4¼% notes in particular are proving more attractive, they said, since they are priced at a discount to yield 4.29%.

Yields are determined by the difference between the purchase price and face value. Lower bidding widens the investors' margin of return. The percentage figures are based on the discount from par and are calculated on

a 360-day year rather than the 365-day year on which yields of bonds, certificates and other Treasury securities are figured.

Accepted bids on the 13-week issue ranged from a high of 99.060 (3.719%) to a low of 99.043 (3.786%), and an average price of 99.047 (3.770%). Of the amount bid for at the low price, 98% was accepted, the Treasury said.

Applications for the latest 13-week issue totaled \$2,102,943,000. The Treasury accepted \$1,300,686,000, including \$234,306,000 offered on a noncompetitive basis and accepted in full at the average price.

These bills are in addition to those dated Feb. 2, 1967, and mature Aug. 3, 1967.

On the 26-week issue, accepted bids ranged from a high of 98.038 (3.881%) to a low of 98.016 (3.924%), and an average price of 98.025 (3.907%). Of the amount bid for at the low price, 3% was accepted, the Treasury said.

Applications for the latest 26-week issue totaled \$1,812,100,000. The Treasury accepted \$1,000,102,000, including \$90,107,000 offered on a noncompetitive basis and accepted in full at the average price.

These bills are dated May 4, 1967, and mature Nov. 2, 1967.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1967]
COMMERCIAL PAPER, CD'S SHORT-TERM INTEREST RATES MOVE UPWARD—FOUR COMPANIES MAKE INCREASES ON 30-TO-89 DAY PAPER—ONE NEW YORK BANK LIFTS TOP CDs

NEW YORK.—Short-term interest rates turned upward in two key sectors of the money market.

Several finance companies raised the rates they pay on certain maturities of commercial paper they issue and place with investors, and at least one major New York City bank, it is understood, has raised to 4½% the top rate it is willing to pay on certain maturities of negotiable certificates of deposit. Previously New York banks were quoting CDs in a range of 4% to 4½%.

The commercial paper rate boost was the first increase in paper rates following more than two months of steady declines.

At least four companies—Chrysler Credit Corp., Commercial Credit Co., G. E. Credit Corp. and Pacific Finance Corp.—raised to 4½% from 4% their rates on 30-to-89 day paper. They left unchanged, however, at 4½%, their rates on 90-to-270 day maturities.

Money market specialists said the boosts came at a time when finance companies were aggressively seeking funds to replace a heavy volume of commercial paper that falls due early this month. They also noted that rates on other money market instruments that compete for short-term investment funds have risen somewhat in recent days.

Yields on certain issues of Treasury bills, for instance, have risen by more than 1-10 percentage point in the last two days of secondary trading.

The CD-rate increase, specialists said, is in line with contentions of some bankers that loan demand is still high and will pick up further with an acceleration of the economy toward the end of the year.

THE INADEQUACY OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, according to accounts in the New York Times of yesterday's date, a

collision occurred between two aircraft making a landing at La Guardia Airport in New York. One of these aircraft was a small single-engine private airplane in which three persons were crushed to death by a twin-engine air taxi airplane which landed on top of it. Nine persons in the air taxi airplane were injured.

Apparently, the control tower had authorized both aircraft to land.

Mr. Speaker, this crash did not make the headlines, but screaming headlines would have been generated had a fully loaded jet airliner been involved and burned.

A situation such as occurred at La Guardia can be related to two cars colliding at an intersection after both had been motioned forward by the policeman at the corner.

Mr. Speaker, how long can situations such as this be tolerated when it has been acknowledged, by many, that air traffic control is inadequate? When will we realize that the FAA needs to do a more effective job than is being done in air safety? And when will the FAA realize that they must institute a policy of training for proficiency rather than checking for proficiency? Are we going to be satisfied with halfway measures and closed committee hearings into air safety matters?

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that the interest of the people is so great in the matter of air safety that we must have open hearings into the entire realm of air safety wherein the companies can present their case, the pilots can present their case, and the FAA can present their case, with each having the benefit of knowing what the other is testifying.

I would further call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the U.S. Government is already liable for millions of dollars in judgments against it as a result of aircraft accidents. We do not here anticipate determining the probable cause of this accident from the sketchy information furnished in the newspaper account. Nor do I anticipate at this time a determination of Federal liabilities in this instance. However, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a serious consideration in these matters and the truth of the situation will again be borne out in the Federal courts of this Nation. Would we not be prudent to modify and update the inadequate air traffic control system and institute other air safety measures?

Mr. Speaker, I again call for a thorough and searching congressional hearing, open to the public, into air safety and would like to again emphasize that while this collision at La Guardia involved smaller aircraft, it could just as well have involved two airliners with hundreds of lives lost. This is the only way that public interest can best be served.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND RECEIVES SCOUTING'S HIGHEST HONOR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1967, General Westmoreland was honored by the Boy Scouts of America with the Silver Buffalo Award for distinguished service to American boyhood. The Silver Buffalo Award represents Scouting's highest adult honor and there certainly is no one more deserving than General Westmoreland, who today commands American forces in Vietnam. Those who serve in Scouting know the significance of this award in terms of contribution to youth leadership training. Under unanimous consent, at this point, I insert in the Record the press release issued by the national office of the Boy Scouts of America:

GENERAL WESTMORELAND RECEIVES SCOUTING'S HIGHEST HONOR, SILVER BUFFALO AWARD

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 28.—General William C. Westmoreland was honored here today by the Boy Scouts of America with the Silver Buffalo Award for distinguished service to American boyhood. Presentation of Scouting's highest adult honor was made in the office of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler by Charles B. McCabe of New York City, Chairman, National Court of Honor, Richard W. Darrow, of Scarsdale, N.Y., and Gen. Bruce C. Clarke (U.S.A., ret.) of Arlington, Va., members of the national executive board of the Boy Scouts of America. The citation read:

"William Childs Westmoreland, General, United States Army, and Commander of all the United States forces in South Vietnam.

"As a young man in Spartansburg, South Carolina, you demonstrated your characteristic determination and drive by becoming an Eagle Scout with Silver Palm and were chosen a member of the United States contingent to the III World Jamboree at Arrowe Park, Birkenhead, England in 1929. Though oriented towards medicine, a meeting with naval officers on the return trip turned you toward service to your country. You received an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point where you graduated first captain of cadets and won the coveted Pershing sword. You were to return to the Point later as its second-youngest superintendent and leave your marks on its curriculum and future design.

"Rising steadily with a distinguished career of combat and command, you have served your country in the best traditions of your profession. In World War II and the Korean conflict you faced death on the beaches and in the air. You jumped with your men as commanding general of the famed "Screaming Eagles", the 101st Airborne Division. Fitness, discipline, bravery and personal integrity have always been your personal hallmarks. You have been decorated for valor by your country and by others.

"You are well known to the people of your country. You were named Man of the Year by an influential news magazine and we have seen your face near the faces of the men under your command in the hinterlands of Vietnam. We have heard your voice encouraging them, congratulating them, and inquiring of their needs. We know you are concerned with The Other War in that tragic land.

"Yet, somehow, with the normal stresses of a military career and the turmoils of wars, you have maintained a steadfast covenant with Scouting and a faith in American youth. You have shown your concern as a man and a father by serving through Scouting whenever possible—as a Scoutmaster in Oklahoma when a young officer, as a committee-man for Scout troops in Pennsylvania and Hawaii, as a member of the Ocoeechee Council Executive Board in North Carolina,

chairman of that council's Together Plan, and as an active member of Region Two Executive Committee, Boy Scouts of America. You served as a panelist at the 1963 Annual Meeting of the Boy Scouts of America. Within the influence of your commands, you have encouraged Scouting for American boys in many places.

"For your distinguished service to boyhood, you were awarded the Silver Beaver by your local council of the Boy Scouts of America in 1964."

MAN OF THE YEAR: COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION RAYMOND F. FARRELL

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Rhode Island State Society of Washington presents to an outstanding Rhode Islander its "Man of the Year Award."

The 1967 recipient of this coveted award is the distinguished and highly esteemed Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Mr. Raymond F. Farrell, and I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some interesting facts concerning his background.

Commissioner Farrell, a native of Pawtucket, R.I., is a graduate of Georgetown University and the Georgetown Law Center. He has served in various governmental agencies, among them the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Interior, and as special counsel to the joint committee in Congress investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In 1941 Mr. Farrell became associated with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. His career with the Immigration and Naturalization Service was interrupted in May of 1942, at which time he went on active duty in the U.S. Army. Mr. Farrell's tour of duty with the U.S. Army was marked by exemplary devotion and rapid advancement. He was the recipient of the Bronze Star Medal for outstanding duty in the Rome-Arno campaign, and at the time of his separation from military service in November of 1945 he was a lieutenant colonel.

Shortly after his discharge from the service, Mr. Farrell returned to the Immigration Service and was named chief of investigations at New York City. In 1949 he was named Assistant Commissioner for Research and Education, and in 1952 he became Assistant Commissioner for Investigation. In 1958 Mr. Farrell was promoted to Associate Commissioner in Charge of Service Operations.

The late President Kennedy nominated Raymond Farrell to the post of Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and he was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate on February 5, 1962. Mr. Farrell's record as Commissioner since 1962 has been recognized as a new era of compassion and understanding in administering the Nation's immigration and nationality

laws. In 1964 President Johnson described Ray Farrell's administration as an example of "Government with a heart."

Mr. Farrell has been honored by Georgetown University's Alumni Achievement Award in 1961 and by the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers with its certificate of appreciation.

The State of Rhode Island is indeed proud of the many accomplishments of Commissioner Farrell. His career in public service has been one of devotion and, its inevitable result, success.

As a close friend of Commissioner Farrell, I deem it both an honor and privilege to know him. As a Rhode Islander and Member of Congress, I am most grateful that a man such as he has devoted his life to public service and has brought such honor to his native State and country.

OEO INTERFERENCE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has injected itself into the governing makeup of the Greater Chester Movement and caused such havoc that the success of every war-on-poverty program in the city of Chester and the county of Delaware is threatened.

When the OEO came into existence, it turned to the Greater Chester Movement, organized to deal with the human, educational, economic, and physical problems of the city, to serve as the "umbrella" agency for all poverty programs throughout Delaware County, a community of over 600,000 people.

Now, the hierarchy of the OEO has turned on the very group from which it sought help, and forced the resignations of GCM members from the steering committee. The forced resignations of the mayor of Chester, the Honorable James H. Gorbey, and his six appointees to the steering committee, has stripped this agency of the leadership of some of the finest, civic-minded individuals it has ever been my privilege to know and to represent.

From the time the GCM became the OEO's local agency, it has been subjected to harassment and attack repeatedly by the very Federal agency which turned to it for help—the OEO.

This situation continued until last week. At that time, Mayor Gorbey and his appointees to the steering committee resigned. And yet, it is the Federal Government which best attests to the tremendous job undertaken by these seven men. The GCM has been the recipient of numerous commendations, from the office of the Vice President on down, for its work in this untried field of human endeavor.

I should like to note here that a recent

evaluation by the OEO cited the GCM's efforts as among the finest in the Nation, and perhaps disappointingly for the OEO, could find nothing wrong with the fiscal management of the agency—this in the face of shortages of funds turning up in many other places throughout the country.

Now, why has the OEO forced Mayor Gorbey and his appointees to resign? They claim these seven men represented political control over the war-on-poverty programs in my district.

To show how ridiculous this claim is, I need only point out that these seven men represented only 20 percent of the 36-member steering committee, and that although Mayor Gorbey is a Republican, his appointees came from both political parties and included the former Democratic chairman of the city of Chester.

To illustrate the caliber of the men forced out by the OEO, let me list them by name and profession: James H. Gorbey, mayor and prominent attorney; Dr. Clarence R. Moll, president, Pennsylvania Military College; Dr. Robert Stanley, gynecologist, and also chairman of GCM steering committee at time of resignation; Leroy F. Wright, president, Delaware County National Bank; William J. Coopersmith, businessman and former Democratic city chairman; Andrew J. Schroeder, vice president of Scott Paper Co.; and H. A. MacNeilly, administrative assistant to Mayor Gorbey.

I say without hesitation that individually, each of these seven men are recognized community leaders who put their own reputations and careers in jeopardy to accept the responsibility for reversing the tide of the underprivileged in Chester when tempers ran high and community feeling was not in sympathy with any program which aided the poor.

Oddly enough, President Johnson recently called on "political activists" to involve themselves in such programs in order to insure their success.

Today, the fight against poverty is in a hopeless mess in Chester and Delaware County. In the wake of the forced resignations of the mayor and his appointees, several staff members, including the executive director, also resigned.

And, I charge here and now, that the Washington bureaucracy of the OEO is solely responsible.

Where the poverty program in Chester goes from here is anybody's guess.

It is my guess that Mayor Gorbey and his appointees will continue to work for the good of Chester. That they will lend their experience and guidance in an effort to reconstruct the shambles that has been caused by the unwarranted interference of the OEO.

There is much more I could say on this situation. I thought long and seriously of calling for a congressional investigation into this situation. But, perhaps the case is best set forth in a letter sent by the seven maligned men to the President. I do not know if he will bother to read it, but I urge my colleagues to read it, to absorb it, and to remember it as we are asked to put more and more power into the hands of those operating the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The letter follows:

CITY OF CHESTER, PA.,
April 27, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: One cannot help but be appalled by the continued harassment of the Greater Chester Movement for having on its Steering Committee the Mayor of Chester and six of his appointees. You and others within OEO, even more than the local action agency, are aware that there would be no Greater Chester Movement in Chester had it not been for the Mayor, the Governor of Pennsylvania and the citizen leaders whom you question and practically malign as politically dominated. They were GCM before there was an OEO. They are the community leaders who put their own reputations and careers in jeopardy to accept responsibility for reversing the tide of the underprivileged in Chester at a time when tempers ran high and community feeling was hardly in sympathy with any program which responded to the needs of the poor, especially the Negro. Aware that Chester's problems were much deeper than the educational system which was at the center of the Negro demonstrations, GCM was organized to deal in an interrelated way with the human, educational, economic, and physical problems of the city. It set out to involve every community agency and every community leader, public or private, black or white, in one singular effort to make Chester a model city of its size. Chester has in microcosm every problem of the large megalopolis, but because of its size the problems are nearer to the surface and easier to reach. Chester's GCM could well be the prototype for correcting the problems which besiege every old, port, or industrial city in America.

No more dedicated or devoted or selfless group of public citizens ever worked on such a responsibility. They raised and borrowed money to hire a staff; they started a community-action center in the ghetto before there was an OEO. They, with the help of ex-President Eisenhower, raised \$30,000 to start an economic renewal program. The Ford Foundation showed interest. The city, the state, the county, gave us unqualified support and help.

As the founders we have a comprehensive picture of GCM's development and its struggle for survival. Few people know the hours, the meetings, the travel which many of us invested in this program, or the heartaches that were ours. For more than twelve months we met six days a week with the Steering Committee, the director, officials of OEO, local Civil Rights leaders and committees. It was not unusual to spend sixteen hours a day on GCM, to have five breakfast meetings a week and meetings every night going on into the morning. So much of our own time went into GCM that we became full time staff members of GCM without compensation. Politics never entered into a decision or an order, either from the standpoint of the Mayor or the members of the Steering Committee until OEO got into the picture. GCM was started with both Republicans and Democrats, but political labels meant nothing when it came to achieving our objectives, namely improving living conditions in Chester. The Mayor was behind the non-partisan, non-political approach from inception. He never interfered with a Steering Committee decision, even though in some cases they jeopardized his political position.

When OEO was in the making, a member of President Johnson's task force on poverty who visited GCM encouraged our original organization as the type that would be needed to run the poverty programs in cities, once a program was established.

Once OEO was founded, GCM's Steering Committee immediately found itself under continual harassment and attack for not being representative of the people, for not

involving the civil rights leaders, for not being representative of the County, for including the Mayor, for including members of the "power structure", for being politically documented. No sooner was one aspect cleared up than another objection came to the fore. Because of OEO's interference, because OEO haggled continually over the subject of GCM Steering Committee membership, the Committee spent so much of its time on organizational matters, that it (1) had no time for anything except OEO problems, (2) spent almost all its time on organizational trivia rather than on program development and in solving Chester's problems, (3) had to give up its broad-based objectives of dealing with economic, physical and educational problems to become nothing more than the agency for administering poverty programs. In short, it became so bogged down in meaningless details that it lost sight of its original objectives—specifically dealing with the problems of a total city.

Because of OEO's program of harassment, a potentially great community action agency must now operate without the leadership of those who gave it origin, strength and support. Now GCM is another bureaucratically run government agency with the veneer of a community Steering Committee whose authority, effectiveness and importance are emasculated through OEO rules and regulations—rules that are more often than not poorly defined and even more inaccurately implemented.

It would be wrong to say that Chester has not benefited from OEO funding nor that GCM did not make progress with the help of OEO, but had OEO given the GCM Steering Committee any opportunity to exercise its own effectiveness, community progress in Chester would be well ahead of where it is now and more importantly, aspects of Chester's problems, especially the economic one, would have been advanced to a point where it could have complemented the Community Action and Training Programs of OEO so as to give them lasting, instead of temporary, significance.

The attitude of OEO officials toward the GCM Steering Committee members appointed by the Mayor has been little short of character assassination. We as founders of the movement, were ready and willing to withstand opposition, criticism, and slander within our own community, but also to become the continual target of OEO leaves us with no choice but to remove ourselves from the Steering Committee in order to permit an orderly continuity of the important community action.

Therefore, the Mayor and his appointees move that the Greater Chester Movement divorce itself from the Poverty Program, permitting its present Steering Committee less the Mayor and his appointees to organize as the official poverty council for Chester and Delaware County, and that the Greater Chester Movement in order to achieve goals over and above human renewal for the city concentrate on the economic growth and development of the city to complement the human renewal benefits of the poverty program.

The group sincerely regrets that one of the outstanding and successful efforts to develop an ongoing relationship between the Mayor, the community leaders and the poor has been hampered and made ineffectual through the policies of the Federal Government which are directly in opposition to the needs of the community which it set out to help.

Mayor James H. Gorbey, city of Chester; Dr. Clarence R. Moll, president of Pennsylvania Military College; Dr. Robert Stanley, Chairman, GCM; Leroy H. H. Wright, President, Delaware County National Bank; William J. Coopersmith, businessman; H. A. MacNeilly, administrative assistant, city of Chester.

(NOTE.—Andrew J. Schroder, Vice President Scott Paper Co., concurred in the action taken but did not see the letter.)

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to the fact that we are commemorating today Polish Constitution Day, which, prior to the Communist takeover of Poland, was their national holiday. The principles of the constitution of May 3, 1791, have lived in the hearts of the Polish people throughout their history of oppression and foreign domination and they are alive today. Our participation in the observance again this year dramatizes the support and interest of the U.S. Congress in the Polish nation and the other peoples who are oppressed captives of communism.

We must continue to support the Polish people's hopes for restoration of their freedom until the day when their rightful aspirations are realized. It is especially tragic that the people of Poland and the other Eastern European nations were delivered into Communist hands by the wartime agreement between President Roosevelt and Soviet Dictator Stalin. It is our obligation to rectify that tragic error.

Although the Polish people have been suffering under Soviet-imposed rule for 22 years now, they are still vigorous in their personal opposition to the Communist system and have shown the courage which will enable them to overcome their Communist oppressors someday.

As they did during the many years of the partition of Poland, the Poles continue to retain their national heritage and distinctive traditions under the cruel Communist tyranny which plagues them. I know that their fortitude is strengthened by the knowledge that they are supported by the thousands of Poles and other exiles among the captive people of Eastern Europe who are thriving in the free world and working for the common goal of restoration of freedom for their homelands.

As we in the Congress pay tribute today to the brave Polish people on their national holiday, we reaffirm our determination to help them achieve the legitimate independence which they have been denied for so long. We who enjoy life in a free country must rededicate ourselves to the philosophy of self-determination of people in order that justice will someday triumph over Communist tyranny and the principles embodied in the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, will once again serve the people of Poland.

In accordance with our desire to dramatize the centuries of progress of the Polish people in their achievements which cannot be suppressed by the present oppressive regime, I am intro-

ducing a bill for the issuance of a special commemorative stamp honoring Madame Marie Skłodowska-Curie. I have introduced this bill today and urge other Members to join me in a concentrated effort to obtain the approval of Postmaster O'Brien and his Advisory Committee.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this great Nation enjoy a heritage unique in the annals of history. We are endowed with a land abundant in natural riches and the freedom to reap its vast harvest. Unfortunately, it is all too easy to live for today and become indifferent to the responsibilities associated with this legacy and our obligations to pass it on to our children and our children's children.

We cannot afford to squander our natural resources and soil. We need to push ahead with planning and conservation efforts. The hard facts of a sharply rising population, economic growth, and widespread indifference toward resource management suggests an unacceptable trend. In this era when we blight the soil with refuse, our streams with sewage, and the air with noxious gases, the call to enter a stewardship of careful husbanding of our basic soil and its resources is a refreshing voice to be heard.

I commend the efforts of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts and all others who are similarly laboring to preserve this most vital part of our national heritage. The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts is a private association of more than 3,000 districts encompassing 49 States. The association has set aside the period of April 30 through May 7 to express gratitude for the gifts of our soil and the bountiful resources associated with it.

The stewardship proposed primarily rests with private citizens who own and manage the bulk or three-fourths of America's land. But we all share this high responsibility.

I am especially pleased to note that the Honorable George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, has also proclaimed April 30 through May 7, 1967, as Soil Stewardship Week in my beloved Michigan. With your permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I commend to the careful reading of all our citizens the Proclamation of Governor Romney issued April 26, 1967.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP PROCLAMATION

The wise use and management of our soil and water resources are imperative today. In Michigan we are blessed with some of the Nation's most productive soils. Our lakes and streams have insured the residents of our State an abundant water supply. However, in a world facing a food shortage, qual-

ity, as well as quantity, of our resource base is important.

Each of us have a responsibility to use our natural resources so they will serve mankind to the fullest extent. Waste, pollution and mismanagement cannot be tolerated as long as our Nation and world so urgently need the bounty of Michigan's farm and forest lands.

Through soil and water conservation, each of us can contribute to the welfare of our community, State and Nation. Michigan's ability to assume leadership is often reflected by the development and management of its most basic resources.

Therefore, I, George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim the period from April 30 to May 7, 1967 as Soil Stewardship Week in Michigan, and request all persons and organizations to unite with Michigan's 82 Soil Conservation Districts in an effort during this week to stimulate among our citizens a full realization of stewardship responsibilities for the conservation of soil and water resources.

EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House passed House Joint Resolution 543, providing for the future extension of time under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. This resolution, in effect, intervenes in the current dispute between the railroad industry and certain employees.

Last month the President asked the Congress to support a resolution to prohibit for 20 days a nationwide rail strike by six shopcraft unions. The President at that time requested emergency legislation to forestall "the threat of a crippling and paralyzing nationwide railroad strike," making the appeal after the unions and carriers failed to reach agreement. It was intimated that the additional 20 days—added to the 60-day "cooling-off" period—would allow time to bring forth a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dispute between the railroads and their employees—and it should be settled by them without persistent Government interference.

The Railway Labor Act contains certain machinery for assistance in solving these problems. The President and the administration have been allowed certain prerogatives in dealing with critical situations. But Government interference should clearly end at the bounds of the law. Indeed, that is why we pass legislation and outline the rules.

I question the belief that the National Legislature should be called into action every time that a dispute is not settled. It should be a matter for the parties involved to decide.

I am sorry to see that the President asked the Congress to intervene again. I did not support this resolution, and I hope that the Congress will not go along with the President in upsetting the bargaining process indefinitely. Such action

must only be taken in the most dire circumstances involving national security and emergency.

FARM INCOME

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks I have been examining the returns on a questionnaire on some of the many large issues facing the Congress.

As of today, nearly 18,000 returns have been received—over one-half of which have additional comments. While I have not as yet read every comment, I would like to report that the most emphatic overwhelming comment relates to farm income.

Thousands of citizens—be they farmers, employers, truckdrivers, mail carriers, or urban families—plead endlessly, "Please do something about farm prices before it is too late."

Mr. Speaker, low milk prices, low fed cattle prices, impending disaster from a large spring pig crop, and faulty estimates on the number of cattle and on the corn supplies by the Department of Agriculture have produced a near hopelessness and frustration "down on the farm."

Hundreds of bills have been introduced to immediately curb the flood of dairy imports; dozens have been introduced and await a hearing on the meat import law. Still there has been no action. Yet each day of delay on the part of the administration and the Congress causes a deeper mortgage on farm real estate and chattels.

In light of this situation, Mr. Speaker, and in light of the widespread feeling of economic and political frustration, the three major farm organizations in Meeker County have jointly sponsored a petition seeking immediate help. These three organizations got over 1,100 farmers to sign this petition in the one county in Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is the result of a joint leadership conference of April 6, 1967, to discuss a common solution to the immediate problems of beef and dairy imports. They seek our assistance in alleviating the price problems that are magnified by the near record imports of these two categories. The leadership of these organizations are to be commended for their united efforts.

It is duly reported that in the calendar year of 1966, we imported almost \$300 million of beef and veal, while we exported only \$13,517,000. On cheese alone, State importers brought in over \$60 million worth of products, while exporting only 5 percent of that amount.

MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 14, 1967, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I spoke out against the rising tide of meat imports into the United States. Since that time, many of my colleagues have done the same. At that time, I called attention to several defects in the Meat Import Act of 1964, including the following: First, the extremely liberal quota; second, the 10-percent overrun factor for triggering imposition of the quota; third, inaccurate estimating by the Secretary of Agriculture, and; fourth, the omission from the quota of certain prepared and processed meat.

Today, Congressman ROBERT DENNEY and I have introduced legislation designed to eliminate the defects in the existing statute. Our proposal, which would repeal the Meat Import Act of 1964, is patterned after that introduced in the other body by Mr. HRUSKA of Nebraska (S. 1588), but with some significant modifications.

This bill, like the Hruska proposal, would eliminate the extra 10 percent of imports now permitted before the quotas become effective. Similarly, the quota would be imposed based upon actual imports rather than estimates by the Secretary of Agriculture, and it would be applied quarterly rather than annually. Finally, offshore purchases of meat by the Defense Department for use of our troops abroad or otherwise would be charged off against the applicable quota.

When the 1964 act was passed, the base quota was derived from the average annual imports for the years 1959-63. However, 1963 was the highest year on record and resulted in a base quota of 725 million pounds. The legislation here proposed would use the years 1958-62 as the base years, with the resulting base quota being 585.5 million pounds.

The differences between my proposal and Mr. HRUSKA's emerge at this point. While the base quotas and the base years are the same, the measure which we have introduced would include prepared and preserved beef, veal, and mutton within the quota, without increasing the base quota. The remaining difference relates to the provision in both bills, authorizing the President to impose quotas on pork and lamb. While the Hruska bill authorizes the imposition of quotas on pork and lamb to "prevent unwarranted imports," my bill would authorize quotas when imports of these items are tending to interfere with the purposes of the Meat Import Act.

I urge my colleagues to consider this bill and the others which have been or may be introduced. But most of all, I urge you to consider the problems which led to their introduction. The agricultural segment of our economy is being ignored and while farm prices are at 72 percent of parity, costs soar higher and higher. Among the hardest hit are the meat producers. They need an import

law that will in fact restrict imports. The existing one does not do the job.

MEMPHIS BOARD OF EDUCATION WINS RECOGNITION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I am able to announce the honor paid to the board of education of the city I have the privilege to represent, Memphis, Tenn. The Memphis Board of Education has been recognized by the National Education Association for outstanding leadership in the field of education for cities over 100,000 population. The fine school system of Memphis is a tribute to the untiring and unselfish service of these civic leaders.

Members of the Memphis Board of Education are: Hugh H. Bosworth, president; Edgar H. Bailey, vice president; and commissioners, Mrs. Lawrence Coe, Mrs. Arthur N. Seessel, and John T. Shea.

INCREASE TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would increase the personal exemption for Federal income taxes from \$600 to \$800 beginning in 1968, and to \$1,000 by 1970. My reason for introducing this legislation is that the present \$600 exemption is grossly inadequate to meet the needs of the average person attempting to provide for himself and his family. The basic reason for this is that, since the enactment of the present \$600 exemption in 1948, prices have continued to rise at such a pace that today it takes \$822 to purchase what one could buy for \$600 20 years ago. For a family of four this means they now need \$3,288 to buy the same goods that cost them \$2,400 in 1948.

An independent study conducted by the AFL-CIO Department of Research in October 1966 reveals the essential income for a family of four in the 20 major cities of the United States. In June 1966, that requisite income was \$6,797. In the city of Detroit, the figures reveal the necessary income to maintain a family of four in a "modest but adequate" family life as \$6,629. These figures, published by the AFL-CIO include an allowance for increased Federal income and social security taxes. Obviously, then, an increase in the personal exemption allowed would reduce the amount of required gross earnings per family.

It is estimated that an increase of \$200 per year in the allowed personal exemption will cost the U.S. Treasury receipts of \$6 billion per year. A review of gross Federal receipts during the past 5 years reveals an average annual increase in receipts of more than \$7 billion. Hence, the diversion of \$6 billion into the hands of the taxpayers to care for their own needs could easily be absorbed by the yearly increase in Federal receipts. It is further estimated that the contemplated increase in the personal exemption to \$1,000 after 2 years would result in an additional loss of \$5.4 billion in Federal receipts. This sum could be absorbed in the same manner.

The effect of diverting these Federal receipts into the hands of the consumer would definitely not result in a loss to the Federal Treasury of the total amount diverted. An increase of \$6 billion in purchasing power will undoubtedly have the effect of increasing the growth of our economy. This happened with the decrease in tax rates in 1964 and would inevitably occur again.

Our economy has been sluggish for some time. And certainly an added boost to the consumer would help to stimulate the economy. But, that aside, I believe it is time for the tax structure to keep pace with the cost-of-living index and urge that colleagues give favorable consideration to this bill.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, for 1968 and 1969, the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$800, and to provide that for taxable years beginning after 1969 such exemptions shall be \$1,000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "\$600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$800";

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "\$1,200" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,600":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

SEC. 2. (a) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "\$800" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000":

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "\$1,600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,000":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than \$5,000, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964) is amended—

(1) by striking out "AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1964" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1965, 1966, and 1967";

(2) by inserting "and before January 1, 1968," after "beginning after December 31, 1964,"; and

(3) by striking out "After December 31, 1964" each place it appears in the tables and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1965, 1966, and 1967".

(b) Section 3 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1967.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1967, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than \$5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section, a tax determined under tables which shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall correspond in form to the tables in subsection (b) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 for the taxable year if the taxable income were computed by taking the standard deduction."

(c) Section 4(a) of such Code (relating to number of exemptions) is amended by striking out "the tables in section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tables in section 3(a) and 3(b) and the tables prescribed under section 3(c)".

(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code (relating to husband or wife filing separate return) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return, the tax imposed by section 3 shall be—

"(A) for taxable years beginning in 1964, the lesser of the tax shown in Table IV or Table V of section 3(a),

"(B) for taxable years beginning in 1965, 1966, or 1967, the lesser of the tax shown in Table IV or Table V of section 3(b), and

"(C) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967, the lesser of the taxes shown in the corresponding tables prescribed under section 3(c).

"(3) Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) shall not apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction; except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) in lieu of the tax shown in Table IV of section 3(a), Table IV of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), as the case may be. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2)."

(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code (cross references) is amended by striking out "and Table V in section 3(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Table V in section 3(b), and the

corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c)".

(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code (relating to election by taxpayer) is amended to read as follows: "In the case of a married individual filing a separate return and electing the benefits of this subsection, Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) shall not apply."

Sec. 4. (a) (1) Section 3402(b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Percentage method withholding table

<i>Payroll period</i>	<i>Amount of one withholding exemption</i>
Weekly -----	\$17.30
Biweekly -----	34.60
Semi-monthly -----	37.50
Monthly -----	75.00
Quarterly -----	225.00
Semiannual -----	450.00
Annual -----	900.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period) -----	2.50".

(2) Such section 3402(b) (1) is further amended by striking out the table inserted by paragraph (1) of this subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Percentage method withholding table

<i>Payroll period</i>	<i>Amount of one withholding exemption</i>
Weekly -----	\$21.20
Biweekly -----	42.30
Semi-monthly -----	45.80
Monthly -----	91.70
Quarterly -----	275.00
Semiannual -----	550.00
Annual -----	1,100.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period) -----	3.00".

(b) (1) Section 3402(m) (1) of such Code (relating to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions) is amended by striking out "\$700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$900".

(2) Such section 3402(m) (1) is further amended by striking out "\$900" (as inserted by paragraph (1) of this subsection) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,100".

(c) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"(1) (A) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee after December 31, 1967, a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this subparagraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables in subparagraph (B) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the deductions were made under subsection (a)."

"(B) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee before January 1, 1968, a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a)."

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to tax-

able years beginning after December 31, 1967, and before January 1, 1970.

(b) The amendments made by section 2 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

(c) The amendments made by section 3 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a) (1) and (b) (1) of section 4 shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1967, and before January 1, 1970. The amendments made by subsections (a) (2) and (b) (2) of section 4 shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1969. The amendment made by subsection (c) of section 4 shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1967.

PARITY DROP AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the stage has again been set to make the American farmer the scapegoat of future rises in food prices.

We on the House Republican task force on agriculture have noted the latest Department of Agriculture report that showed the farm parity ratio had dropped another 2 points between March 15 and April 15, to a depression-year low of only 72. Little attention is being paid to this drop in parity and the resulting drop in food prices. We also note that the latest reported cost of living figures reveal a consumer price index rise of two-tenths of 1 percent from February to March. The cost of living rose even though the cost of food actually dropped due to a coincident decline in the index of prices received by farmers and a rise in the index of prices paid for commodities and services by our farmers. With living costs rising at a time when food prices are declining, we can only imagine the flood of complaints later on when and if farm prices reverse themselves and rise to the already-low levels of a year ago.

It is strange that such a significant drop in parity can take place without any discernible concern being expressed by the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else in the administration. It should have elicited a prompt call for immediate and coordinated action for dairy and other commodity import controls, beef import legislation, and emergency action by every appropriate agency of Government to muster every available force to protect the farmers' income. But no such concern or request for action has been forthcoming, making earlier warnings by our task force even more pertinent and prophetic.

We warned that American agriculture could expect little help in the fight to share equitably in the Nation's economy, and this latest drop in parity confirms our fears. As the task force pointed out, while estimated annual personal income from nonagricultural sources rose 8 per-

cent from the March 1966 rate to the March 1967 rate, estimated annual personal income from farming dropped 16 percent.

The tragedy of the situation is the strange silence when farm income keeps dropping, forcing more and more of our rural people into the overcrowded cities. But the cries of anguish will again be heard in the land if and when the farmer even recaptures the level of income he had as recently as a year ago, which even then was unconscionably far below the rest of the Nation. His income could rise a great deal and still be tragically low, far below parity. But the temptation will be to blame the farmer, a maneuver far easier to perform than to identify the real beneficiaries of the consumers' grocery dollars.

This is why we on the Republican task force on agriculture are renewing our determination to see that there is a more appropriate consideration for American agriculture when the prices of food are tallied.

MINERAL LEASING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act which would permit railroads to lease lands containing coal deposits.

Similar legislation has been approved by the Senate three times in recent years but the House has never acted on it.

Whatever justification there may have been for this prohibition against coal leases by railroads disappeared with the change to diesel-powered locomotives. In its present form, the law serves only as a hindrance to the economic development of the vast coal resources of North Dakota and other Western States.

Land grant railroads such as the Northern Pacific were given alternate sections of land along their rights-of-way at the time they were built. This resulted in an artificial checkerboard pattern of coal and mineral ownership. It is not economically feasible for the railroads to mine these coal deposits unless they are permitted to lease intervening tracts of land or to enter into joint ventures with other owners.

A survey sponsored by the Federal Power Commission predicts the Nation's use of electricity will treble by 1980. It estimates that coal consumption by electric utilities will increase from a little more than 200 million tons a year now to 500 million tons in 1980. If the REA cooperatives and the private power companies of the West are to meet tomorrow's greatly increased demands, present coal production must be increased enormously.

The coal deposits are there. One way to help get this vast reservoir of fuel out

of the ground would be to remove the restrictions which now prevent the railroads from developing their coal lands.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. ASHBROOK ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1967 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF OHIO'S 17TH DISTRICT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for the seventh time in as many years, it has been my honor to conduct a public opinion poll of the 17th District of Ohio, the eight-county area which I represent. The results to the poll are truly gratifying, and the questionnaire seems to become more popular each year. Well over 20,000 persons participated in the poll, including persons from various States in the Union who were sent polls by friends from the 17th District, and high school students in nearly every school in the area.

The sampling of opinion again was

taken from all of the 628 voting precincts in the district and the poll was distributed to persons of all political leanings. In addition to the printed questionnaires which I sent out, various newspapers published copies of the poll and many persons cut these out, answered them and sent them in.

While by some standards this attempt at opinion sampling was not scientific, every effort was made to reach as many people as possible, on a variety of issues, through questions which allowed a full spectrum of answers.

It was particularly gratifying to note the number of persons who not only took the time to fill in the questionnaire, but also took time to add a note or letter elaborating on one or more particular points.

The primary areas of concern, as expressed in the letters, were the war in Vietnam and the military draft. Near the top of the list, and running the war and resulting problems with the draft a close second, was the ever-growing concern with the increasing size and control of the Federal Government.

A poll of this magnitude takes time and effort, but it is well worth it for me to keep up to date with the thoughts of the people I represent. The poll does this in a way that is invaluable in deter-

mining the opinions of the people—opinions which I do not have time enough to find out individually.

The tabulated results of the poll are included but I would like to point out several areas where the voters overwhelmingly took one side of an issue or another.

Starting with the issue which headed the list of concern, Vietnam, the greatest response indicated that we should go all out to win. Nearly 90 percent of the responses indicated that they thought the war on poverty had been a failure and 85 percent were against the President's proposed surtax.

The war on poverty and foreign aid were the two areas where the people said expenditures should be cut back.

In the vital area of East-West trade and President Johnson's plans for "building bridges" to Communist nations to increase trade, the people of the 17th District were more than two to one against such proposals.

In the results below, the various percentages do not always add up to 100 percent. This is because some people did not answer some of the questions or, on the multiple choice questions they answered two choices, indicating that there were two areas which they thought applied.

7th annual public opinion poll of the 17th District

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the \$2,000,000,000 war on poverty has been successful?	7	89
2. With a \$15 to \$20,000,000,000 deficit imminent in the next fiscal year, President Johnson has proposed a 6-percent additional surtax and some expanded Great Society programs. Do you favor the tax increase?	10	85
3. If you do not favor the tax increase, would you reduce the expenditure of the following programs?		
(a) War in Vietnam	24	
(b) War on poverty	64	
(c) Foreign aid	80	
(d) Federal aid to education	22	
4. Do you think the fiscal predicament of the Federal Government is urgent enough to merit across-the-board cuts of 5 or 10 percent in all programs?	60	28
5. Do you believe that public employees such as teachers, firemen, and policemen should have the right to strike?	33	62
6. The President has suggested a 20-percent increase in social security payments with added payroll taxes to help finance these increases. Do you favor this proposal?	22	58
7. Which proposal more nearly expresses your opinion regarding financing social security benefits? (Check only 1.)		
(a) When cost-of-living increases are granted, payroll taxes should be increased to cover the cost of the additional benefits paid out of the social security fund	37	
(b) Some of the cost of increased benefits should come out of general tax revenues	53	
8. President Johnson has proposed a new program to increase trade with Communist bloc countries. Do you favor a relaxation of present trade restrictions with Communist countries?	30	63
9. The war in Vietnam has caused many questions to be raised about the military draft.		
(a) Do you believe the present draft system should be changed?	44	
(b) Are you in favor of a lottery system of selecting draftees?	13	
(c) Do you favor universal military training where all young men would serve a predetermined length of time in the military?	51	
(d) If universal military training is adopted, should women also be included?	17	
(e) When a young man is drafted, should he be free to choose a civilian service, such as the Peace Corps, in place of military service such as the Army or Navy?	28	
(f) Would you favor eliminating the draft entirely and raising the pay and benefits of military men, in the hope that enough men would choose this career to fill the ranks?	23	
10. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson indicated he wanted to continue our efforts in Vietnam at the present level. What do you think? (Check only 1.)		
(a) Expand the war into North Vietnam and go all out to win	43	
(b) Continue current policies of support without expanding or reducing our efforts appreciably	6	
(c) Work toward a negotiated settlement through a conference of concerned nations or the U.N. and agree to abide by their decision and withdraw U.S. troops when a settlement has been reached	31	
(d) Withdraw U.S. troops and let the Vietnamese solve their own problems	13	
11. Do you approve of the concept of tax sharing—that is, a set percentage of Federal tax receipts would be returned without strings to State governments for education and other services?	67	15
12. Do you believe that schoolchildren should be "bused"—that is, transported from one school to another to maintain a racial balance?	5	89
13. There is great debate about food prices. Which one of these factors do you think is most responsible for these high prices? (Check only 1.)		
(a) Middleman profit	23	
(b) Government spending and taxing policies	35	
(c) Union wage demands	26	
(d) Business profits	7	
(e) Prices paid to farmers	14	

ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1967

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am joining a number of colleagues in introducing today the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967.

This legislation has already been sponsored in the other body by my distin-

guished colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and by Senator Moss of Utah, in addition to some 34 other Senators.

This bill would launch a concerted attack against the Nation's fourth most serious health problem. Alcoholism affects about 5 to 6 million Americans, and

ranks in number behind only heart disease, mental illness, and cancer.

Our measure would attempt to deal with this problem on four fronts:

First, it would establish a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control within the Office of the Surgeon General to coordinate and direct Federal alcoholism programs.

Second, it provides grants for demonstration projects for detoxification centers, court-supervised projects for alcoholics, programs in correctional institutions and aftercare for alcoholics, as recently recommended by the President's Crime Commission. For fiscal year 1968, some \$20 million is authorized for this purpose.

Third, it provides for a special study project on personnel practices and current and projected needs in the field of alcoholism. The bill authorizes \$500,000 for fiscal year 1968 for the study.

Fourth, it establishes a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism Care and Control.

Mr. Speaker, this measure implements the areas of concern and the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission on this matter as well as those of the National Conference on Alcoholism sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1963. The provisions I have outlined will also help the States to meet their new responsibilities under recent court decisions which have held that chronic alcoholics must be treated not as criminals, but as patients with medical and social problems.

This is the approach that the Congress endorsed in 1966 with the passage of the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act and, in my judgment, we have already let the costs of alcoholism mount far too high without taking similar action. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we will act on this legislation during the present session of the Congress.

EXPO 67

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, Expo 67 opened in Montreal on April 28. By all accounts, it is an exciting and creative fair.

Further, Ambassador Stanley R. Tupper, a former distinguished Member of this House, is the U.S. Commissioner General at Expo. We are fortunate that a public servant of his caliber is representing our Nation at this important international event.

The New York Times commented on the opening of Expo in an editorial on April 28. I think that Members will find this piece of interest, and under unanimous consent, I am including it in the RECORD.

EXPO 67

Canada and the United States both have hits in Expo 67, which opens in Montreal to-

day. The fair bids to be one of the great international shows of the century, and the United States Pavilion is a standout—a joyous distillation of the best American art, science and culture, no less profound for its easy wit and beauty.

A world's fair, of course, should be all fun, or at least painless instruction. But there are serious lessons to be learned in Montreal. These lessons are pertinent because several cities are already vying for the international exhibition to mark the United States bicentennial in 1976. After New York's sad fair of two years ago, Expo 67 is sheer delight.

The facts of fairs, as demonstrated in Montreal, are going to be hard for American cities to grasp, since most of them consider it gospel, as New York did, that all money invested must be returned at a conventional percentage, and the national culture is best symbolized by massive doses of chrome-plated commercialism.

Expo expects no profits. It is a frankly deficit operation. The money is 50 per cent federal, 37½ per cent provincial and 12½ per cent municipal. The bookkeeping is considered fully balanced in terms of visitors and business attracted, municipal improvements completed, and luster added to the Canadian reputation. Commercialism is rigidly controlled, under the bureau's explicit rules. The 63 national pavilions are there as "ambassadors," according to a fair official, "not as hucksters."

Expo is a designed fair. Every element, starting with the basic site plan, has been controlled by the fair's chief architect and staff. Every pavilion was subject to review. Even with controls, the variety of form, shape and style is stupendous and exhilarating, and the whole is woven together with theme buildings, services and public spaces of a design quality that would permanently grace any city in the world.

The demonstration is clear. Expo is in the tradition of great world fairs. Each country is making the most striking and extravagant statements possible of its architecture, arts and sciences. Fortunately, the United States has finally recognized, in its glittering Buckminster Fuller "skybreak bubble," that its best cultural exports are its dynamic young talent and its innovative masters. The combination steals the scene.

There are more lessons in the shining new subway that combines art and function, on the ride back to Montreal, and in the city, where massive skyscraper blocks are being joined underground by efficient and elegant multilevel planning. There are more good new buildings in the heart of Montreal than in almost any equivalent acreage in Manhattan. New York can learn about other things than fairs from this Canadian jewel city.

URGENT NEED TO REGULATE EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman SCHERLE, and I are cosponsoring and introducing legislation to tighten controls on the import of beef into the United States.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill with Mr. SCHERLE for several reasons. First of all, this is one of the first cosponsorships of legislation pursuant to the amendment to the House rules which was

accomplished last week. Second, his district adjoins mine. But most important of all, I believe this bill to be an effective and realistic solution.

Mr. SCHERLE, myself, and our staffs for several months have been working closely with Senator HRUSKA of the other body. For that reason, our bill is similar to S. 1588—Hruska bill—but it does have a significant difference as far as the quota is concerned.

Like S. 1588, the base period is changed to 1958–62, or 585.5 million pounds, so as to delete the effect the high imports of 1963 had on the quota established under the Meat Import Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Texas, Congressman PRICE, and those who joined with him the other day ably outlined the main features of the Hruska proposal, I will not take up my colleagues' time by reiterating them or the supporting figures showing the need for this legislation. However, I do feel that our bill, to be known as H.R. 9616, closes a big loophole. Our bill includes canned, preserved, and processed beef and veal under the quota.

Mr. Speaker, myself and a number of my colleagues have been forced to introduce legislation to plug just such a loophole in the area of dairy imports. With the ingenuity and flexibility possessed by importers, I feel it is imperative that in order to provide effective relief, they be prevented from circumventing the quota by importing beef in other forms.

In closing, let me say that I was pleased last Friday when the gentleman from Arkansas introduced similar legislation. Knowing the concern of him and a number of my colleagues, I am hopeful that hearings will be held on these bills within the next few weeks.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken several times in recent days concerning the incredible lengths to which the administration has gone in attempts to misrepresent my proposed amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These attempts—including the extravagant remarks of President Johnson—have gone too far.

All of us in representing our points of view may occasionally err in the direction of overstating our case; but if there is one thing this House demands it is a straight set of facts. A straight set of facts, as Members in both parties increasingly recognize, is often the single most difficult thing to obtain from the present administration. Yesterday one of my valued colleagues erred in inserting into this RECORD—in all good faith—a table supplied to him by the U.S. Office of Education purporting to show "allotments" for selected major cities under

the House committee bill, H.R. 7819, and my bill, H.R. 8983, for fiscal year 1968.

The only thing wrong with the chart is that the figures shown for my bill have no relationship to it in the form in which it will be submitted as an amendment. When I introduced H.R. 8983 for discussion purposes, I clearly stated that it would be offered as an amendment to the committee bill. It will amend title III of the committee bill, which extends authorizations of the present act through fiscal year 1969. Accordingly, it would have absolutely no effect on the other provisions of the committee bill which alter the title I formula by suspending the "Quile-Perkins amendment" of last year. Therefore, the figures attributed to my bill by the Office of Education chart have no application to the amendment I shall offer. Rather, they show estimated allotments in the present act as they would stand without the changes made by the committee bill.

The Office of Education easily could have ascertained all this by calling either me or our minority committee counsel. They did not. Instead, they assumed that my amendment would replace the entire committee bill, which it will not do, and let my respected colleague release figures which are inapplicable and misleading in the extreme.

To repeat: The figures shown in the chart inserted on page 11503 of the RECORD for May 2 have absolutely no relationship to the amendment I shall offer to the committee bill, H.R. 7819.

Under my amendment, which will not be effective until fiscal year 1969, it would not be possible to estimate allotments for individual cities, as these will be determined in accordance with priorities of need established by the State. Therefore, the chart is completely misleading.

I do not make this statement to embarrass my colleague, whom I respect, because all of us must rely upon these Federal agencies for data. When the assumptions of the agencies are wrong, or their data is wrong, we are wrong. However, in the interests of fairness, I do feel compelled to set the record straight.

I also want to add the note that the Office of Education included with a table they sent up on the cities mentioned:

NOTE.—The estimated amounts for FY 1968 are based on estimated State amounts indicated on the attached table. Using State totals of children estimated to be counted, amounts per child were calculated for the respective States, estimates of children to be counted were made for counties, and these were multiplied by the State amounts per child. Ratio estimates based on previous allocations were applied to the county amounts to obtain the figures for the various cities. Details of this method differ slightly from methods employed previously to estimate amounts for cities; however the figures probably are no more accurate because the data used which included some from the *County and City Data Book, 1962*, may not reflect the criteria which will be used by the State offices when they make sub-county allocations. Amounts shown are those estimated to be available for local programs only—differences between amounts shown here and those on State tables represent the funds estimated to be available for programs which are State operated or State supported.

Amounts shown for the Committee Report are slightly higher than could be expected because calculations have not been made by program. It is impossible to estimate the extent of this error.

REALISTIC MEAT IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE] and many of our colleagues in introducing a bill to establish realistic meat import quotas.

Passage of this bill will help ease the great economic strain that is being placed on farmers from competition with cheaply produced foreign meat products. This is occurring in many of our domestic industries, but I think we can agree that agriculture has been most severely affected and that it most needs our support.

This bill we are introducing, along with a bill relating to import quotas for dairy products which I introduced recently, will help the farmer get back on his feet. The past few years have seen prices paid to farmers decline even while the purchasing power of the dollar is also decreasing. The result has been that per capita farm income decreases drastically at the same time the rest of society enjoys a rising per capita income. Further, many farmers have been forced out of business. This is not a healthy situation for the farmer or the Nation.

The policy of reciprocal trade is certainly excellent and I do not believe we are advocating the elimination of it. We are, however, urging that the interests of U.S. farmers come before those of foreign producers. We are not advocating significant trade barriers. The bill provides for substantial and realistic meat imports as well as allowing the import quota to increase at the same percentage rate our domestic production increases.

The bill will, however, use the realistic 1958-62 period for determining the base quota. It will include Defense Department offshore purchases of meat as part of the quota. It will eliminate the requirement that imports must reach 110 percent of the quota before the quota may be imposed. And, it will eliminate the need for the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate in advance the expected beef imports which estimates have proven to be so unrealistic.

The farm parity ratio has now reached its lowest point in 33 years. The agricultural policies of the present administration are most responsible for this decline and the Congress must act to prevent any further ruin of this important segment of our economy. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will proceed rapidly to consideration of the problems of both meat and dairy imports and I hope we can see early passage of legislation to end these problems.

TROOP REDUCTION IN EUROPE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support the administration's announced reduction of 35,000 men in deployment of American military forces in Europe. As I understand, this means that both ground and air units will be involved, and they will be returned, with their dependents, to the United States.

I have been in favor of such a move for some time on account of considerations of costs, but especially because of the effect on the balance of payments. In my judgment, this decision is sound militarily and from the standpoint of foreign policy. It is to be hoped that this will be the initial step in an adjustment of our NATO commitments to accord with the changes in Europe and with the attitudes and efforts of the Europeans themselves with respect to that organization. After all, our troops in Europe are actually a token force to make evident U.S. determination to resist Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that administration officials have been able to negotiate this adjustment in our commitment. I am hopeful that they will continue to work in this area and explore the possibilities of further reductions in the future.

AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY INSURANCE—A JOB FOR CONGRESS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, each week that goes by, additional facts uncovered make the case for a congressional investigation of automobile liability insurance more persuasive.

In an article recently published in the Hartford, Conn., Times by Robert W. Lucas, of the Gannett News, are cited additional factors necessitating this congressional inquiry. Mr. Lucas quotes Joseph D. Thomas, California's chief assistant insurance commissioner, as saying:

The problem of unfair cancellation or non-renewal is probably the hottest problem in the state at this time.

I have heretofore pointed out problems as they affected Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Maryland.

This statement and Mr. Lucas' article shows that not only California, but almost every other State in the Union has similar difficulties in the field of automobile liability insurance.

I am convinced that no individual State can do the job that must be done.

It requires national effort and the Congress is the only appropriate investigative body that has the legal jurisdiction, the adequate funds, and the competent staffing to do the job. As Mr. Lucas says in his article:

This is the only way the facts may be ascertained.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today King Stanislaw II rose before the Polish Diet and led the deputies in swearing allegiance to a new Constitution. This document of May 3, 1791, was so significant that ever since it has been hailed as a landmark of liberalism in Europe. The Polish people, in adopting a new Constitution, sought to modernize their governmental institutions, giving the towns representation in the lawmaking bodies, clarifying and limiting the power of the monarchy, creating a system of ministerial responsibility, and establishing absolute religious toleration.

Poland, however, was not left alone to pursue her peaceful development. Russia and Prussia invaded Poland, divided much of her territory between them and reinstituted the harsh and oppressive measures of foreign domination. Yet the Poles kept alive their devotion to freedom and to democratic institutions and, whenever remotely possible, they attempted to break away from their oppressors. In 1831 they gained their freedom by armed insurrection for nearly 10 months; in 1846 the Poles again revolted against their captors and still again in 1848, and in 1861, and in 1863. After each revolt the Russians took more severe measures to enslave the Polish people; their Russification practices even included conscription in World War I, forcing Poles to fight Poles.

After World War I, the Polish nation finally gained its opportunity to become independent—after 125 years of captivity. The Republic of Poland was proclaimed on November 3, 1918, and a permanent Constitution was adopted in March 1921. But while the names of Poland's neighbors had changed, the motives of Germany and the U.S.S.R. had not. Poland was again overrun. Today, Poland is once more under the heel of Russia and while some liberalization trends are apparent, Poland is far from realizing the ideals set forth in the 1791 Constitution. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to recognize the valiant struggle for independence made by the Polish people and add my voice to those of my colleagues in proclaiming our dedication to their fight for freedom.

ANALYSIS OF SCHWEIKER DRAFT REFORM ACT OF 1967

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, I introduced H.R. 5017, the Draft Reform Act of 1967. This is the first comprehensive draft reform legislation to be introduced in the 90th Congress.

With hearings on this subject starting today before the House Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, I felt it would be helpful for our colleagues to have a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 5017.

I am, therefore, setting forth below a summary analysis of my bill, prepared with the assistance of Mr. Albert Stillson, analyst in national defense, for the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress:

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS OF H.R. 5017

(A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act, introduced in the House of Representatives, 90th Congress, first session, on February 7, 1967)

SECTION 1

Establishes the short title of the Act as the "Draft Reform Act of 1967."

SECTION 2

Amends various provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (UMTSA) that relate to the age period of liability for induction.

A. Section 2(a) reduces from 18-26 to 18-22½ the age period during which the time for registration is fixed.

B. Sections 2(b)(2) and 2(b)(5) reduce the age period from 18-26 to 18-22½ with respect to establishing minimum standards for physical acceptability that are no higher than those applied to men inducted in January 1945, and with respect to registrants volunteering for induction.

C. Sections 2(b)(1) and 2(b)(4) reduce the age period from 18½-26 to 18-22½ with respect to persons liable for training and service, and with respect to the opportunity registrants are given to enlist in the regular army.

D. Sections 2(b)(3), 2(c)(1), and 2(c)(2) reduce the upper age limit from 26 to 22½ with respect to induction without consent, with respect to enlisting or accepting appointment in the Ready Reserve, and with respect to induction liability if obligations of service in the Ready Reserve are not met.

E. Section 2(d) substitutes 18-22½ for 18-26 in defining specifically the terminology applied to age groups that are referred to in UMTSA.

SECTION 3

Deals with priority for induction and selection for induction from a national manpower pool. Section 3 amends UMTSA in the following ways:

A. Section 5(a)(1) sets down provisions for the transmission of data from local boards to the Director of Selective Service. [This is part of the centralization of the Selective Service System that the bill would accomplish.]

B. Section 5(a)(2) provides that registrants shall be liable to induction for 4 years, unless a registrant has been exempted or deferred, in which case his liability will terminate whenever he has been liable for 4 years or has become 35 years of age. [This alters the present 19-26 age span of liability,

or liability to age 35 if deferred or exempted before age 26.]

C. Section 5(a)(3) establishes 4 age-priority categories in a national manpower pool of registrants who are not exempt or deferred, from which pool 18½-year-olds will be called first. "The first priority category shall consist of (i) men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 19 years and 6 months [19½-20½, 20½-21½, and 21½-22½ in the second, third, and fourth categories, respectively] who have not been exempted or deferred from induction under the provisions of this Act, and (ii) men not presently so exempted or deferred who are less than 35 years of age and with respect to whom, if the aggregate of all periods they were so exempted or deferred were subtracted from their age, the difference would be less than 19 years and six months [19½ or more but less than 20½, 20½ or more but less than 21½, and 21½ or more but less than 22½ in the second, third, and fourth categories, respectively]." [This section is designed to serve the objective of centralizing draft calls and avoiding regional variations in their size and nature. Present policy is to take the older men under 26 first. This section reverses present policy by providing that 18½-year-olds not exempt or deferred be called first. In addition, it "returns" an older man to the manpower pool if he was deferred or exempt during all or part of his years from 18½ to 22½ and ceases being deferred or exempt any time before he is 35. The older man "returns" to the age-priority category corresponding to his age at the time he first became deferred or exempt. Under present draft policy, men taking deferments incur liability up to age 35 but men over 26 are not called by a local board until it has taken all those under 26 and over 19.]

D. Section 5(a)(4) establishes procedures incumbent on the Director of Selective Service for placing in the first age-priority category the name of each registrant who, on the date the Act becomes law, is 19½-26 years of age and who has not received an exemption or deferment, or who "on such date was not exempted or deferred and was between the ages of 19 years and six months and 35 years and had received an exemption or deferment under this Act after attaining the age of 19 years and 6 months but not before attaining such age."

"While he is not exempted or deferred under this Act and before he attains the age of 35 years, insofar as possible, each person shall, after remaining in the first priority category for one year, be placed in each succeeding higher priority category established under paragraph (3) for a period of one year."

E. Section 5(a)(5) provides that each registrant who, on the date the Act becomes effective, was exempted or deferred, was between 19½ and 35, and had not been exempted or deferred between 18½ and 19½, shall, upon the termination of his exemption or deferment, be placed in the first age-priority, "remain in such category for one year and in each succeeding higher category established under paragraph (3) for a period of one year; except that such person shall not be in any such category during any period while he is exempted or deferred from selection for induction or after he attains the age of 35 years." [Sections 5(a)(4) and 5(a)(5) prevent this legislation from giving any windfall draft benefit to draftable men who are over 19½ at the time the act becomes effective. Many of these men will be too young to have been reached by the draft under the present system. Yet without these special provisions assigning them to the 18½-year-old, first-priority category, the new law would pass them by with its emphasis on drafting men at 18½. These sections prevent men who waited until 19½ to take a deferment under present law from "counting" that year of draft eligibility

(between 18½ and 19½) as a basis for their "returning" to the 19½-year-old pool under this legislation. If allowed to count that year, they would escape the top-priority (18½-year-old) draft pool under the new system while having been too young to be reached under the present system.]

F. Section 5(b) provides that the Director of Selective Service shall select inductees at random in the order of the age-priority categories in which their names are entered. Before random selections are made from within a category, every man available for induction from a lower numbered priority category must have been drafted. [Random selection of draftees would be a major change in the Universal Military Training and Service Act.]

SECTION 4

Establishes uniform national standards for occupational and educational deferments.

A. Section 4(a) amends UMTSA so that section 6(2) provides that the President shall set forth specific rules and regulations governing the bases of deferment from induction. Rules and regulations pertaining to occupational deferments "may incorporate any listing of critical skills and industries prepared by any department or agency of the Federal Government." Rules and regulations pertaining to educational deferments "shall set forth standards of performance in . . . [college level] courses of instruction, scores on tests conducted under the supervision of the Director, and other necessary criteria which must be complied with in order to qualify for such a deferment." Every registrant shall conform to these rules and regulations "in every respect" before a local board can grant him a deferment. [Present system is changed in that local boards would be required to apply national standards.]

B. Section 4(b) amends UMTSA so that a registrant deferred to pursue a full-time college-level course of instruction may not be deferred subsequently "on account of a marriage contracted or a child conceived after the date of enactment of the Draft Reform Act of 1967." [Under present system an educational deferment can be followed by a deferment based on marriage or fatherhood.]

C. Section 4(c) repeals an express provision of Section 6(h), UMTSA, that local draft boards and appeal boards cannot be bound by any Federal guideline in the granting of student and occupational deferments. The repealed language reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government."

SECTION 5

Makes certain procedural provisions. Section 5 amends UMTSA so that:

A. Section 6(n)(1) requires local boards to reopen the cases of men classified I-A whenever new information comes forth which, if proven, would entitle them to a deferment or exemption. The Director shall not induct such men while reconsideration is being made. [Local boards now reopen cases at their discretion, unless the State or National Director of Selective Service orders them to do so.]

B. Section 6(n)(2) provides that a regis-

trant has at least 15 days in which to appeal an action taken with respect to him. [Lengthens by 5 days the minimum period during which a registrant can appeal.]

SECTION 6

Pertains to the extension of UMTSA by amending subsection (c) of section 17 of that act so as to extend induction authority to July 1, 1971.

SECTION 7

Sets effective dates for the Act by stating that "except for section 6 which shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, this Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment."

THE STRATEGIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES RESERVE ACT OF 1967

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, in the House of Representatives, legislation to establish a strategic agricultural commodities reserve for the United States.

The subject of national food reserves has been debated both in and out of Congress for a number of years. Recently, however, the entire question has taken on a new urgency in light of the growing world food and population problem.

Unlike other countries, the United States has been blessed with a highly efficient agriculture and an abundance of food. We have never been faced with widespread food shortages, and it is hard for most of us to imagine a combination of circumstances that could place us in a position to make strategic national food and fiber reserves necessary. Yet, when we examine the issue closely under the cold light of logic, we must conclude that food shortages in this country are not an impossibility—it can happen here.

American agriculture over the years has become increasingly mechanized. The time when U.S. farmers were virtually self-sufficient is long past. Modern farms are as dependent as many factories on the availability of fuel, spare parts, transportation, electricity, and manufactured goods. This mechanization and resultant dependency have made U.S. agriculture vulnerable as never before. Without question, the effect of a nuclear attack on our agricultural production would be disastrous, but aside from that, any situation which would restrict the availability of fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, spare parts, and other such items necessary for present-day farming operations could result in greatly diminished food production. Even a conventional conflict could have serious effects on our productive capabilities. Already, the current war in Vietnam is being felt in many ways both by agriculture and by other industries.

But this is only one facet of the need for a national reserve of strategic agricultural commodities. The possibility of

widespread crop failure due to weather conditions has been forcefully thrust upon our awareness in recent months. While it now appears that prospects for the new wheat crop in the Great Plains are improving, the situation has given us pause to reflect and consider just how dependent we really are on good weather for our agricultural bounty.

In the past, we have tended to look upon agricultural surpluses in this country as an evil, rather than a blessing. This, perhaps, is one of the most important reasons why we have not been sufficiently concerned with the need for strategic national food and fiber reserves. In addition, the fact that Government storage bins have been bulging with excess has given us a false sense of security. But, this has changed, and with it our thinking must also change. Our past surpluses are gone, the world is crying for food, and our domestic carryover of wheat and feed grains is dropping to what could be dangerous levels.

One year of widespread crop failure, such as occurred in the middle thirties, could put us in an extremely tight supply situation unless we cut back on our commitments abroad. More than 1 year of inclement weather could cause worse problems. We are assured that we have sufficient crop acreage in reserve to supply our growing food needs in the future, but even if this is the case, reserve acreage will be of little immediate value in case of a general crop failure due to bad weather conditions.

The need for a national reserve of strategic agricultural commodities is well documented, and I have only superficially touched some of the major reasons for the establishment of such a stockpile. We are now maintaining reserves of many other strategic commodities—is food or fiber any less important?

Under the terms of my bill, farmers would receive the prevailing market price for commodities sold to the Commodity Credit Corporation for reserve stocks. It would be grossly unfair to ask that they receive less. I must frankly concede, also, that in considering the creation of national agricultural reserves, I have been concerned over how such a stockpile might be used—or misused—as an instrument of market price manipulation.

My bill would minimize the effects on the marketplace by placing safeguards on both the purchase and sale of the strategic agricultural commodity reserve inventories. Commodities in this reserve would be effectively insulated from the market, with a specific formula to be followed for sales, and another set formula to be used for purchases. In rotating reserve stocks which are in danger of going out of condition, sales may be made, but the bill requires immediate purchases to offset such sales. These provisions and safeguards will allow producers and the trade to know exactly how the reserve inventories will be handled, and under what conditions they can expect purchases and sales. Only in this way, I feel, can we be sure that farm prices will be sufficiently protected, and the normal channels of commodity trade will be least disrupted.

The bill which I am introducing today would authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserve inventories of wheat, feed grains, and cotton—our basic food and fiber crops.

Wheat reserves would be maintained at 300 million bushels—a level equal to approximately half our annual domestic consumption. Feed grain reserves of 25 million tons would be stockpiled—an amount equal to about one-seventh of our current total annual domestic consumption. Cotton stocks of 3 million bales would be held in reserve—enough to supply roughly one-third of our domestic needs. These amounts should provide an adequate and satisfactory reserve for potential emergency needs, taking into account our annual domestic consumption and the stocks which will ordinarily be carried by private trade.

Immediately upon enactment of the bill, at least one-half of the existing uncommitted Commodity Credit Corporation inventories of wheat and feed grains, and one-third of the existing uncommitted CCC inventory of cotton would be designated as reserves under the act.

The remainder of the reserves would be purchased on the open market at the prevailing market price by a formula outlined in the bill. The formula provides that the total annual amount of a commodity to be purchased shall be evenly divided into 52 parts, and one part is to be purchased each week of the year. This will even out the effects of such purchases on the marketplace.

The bill provides a maximum 5-year period in which to build the reserve inventories up to the desired levels, and authorizes the CCC to purchase the lesser of the following each marketing year:

First, the amount of the excess of anticipated domestic production and imports of wheat, feed grains, and cotton over anticipated domestic use and exports of such commodities; or

Second, the amount by which the stocks of wheat, feed grains, and cotton in the reserve inventories fall short of the reserve level requirements.

In any case, however, not less than 20 percent of the reserve level requirement of each commodity shall be purchased in any 1 year, unless the reserve inventory of the commodity is over 80 percent of the requirement.

This formula would insure the steady buildup of the strategic reserve inventories, and would have a stabilizing effect on the market. It would minimize the threat of market manipulation, and would bring supply and demand into better balance. The producer will benefit from strengthened prices, the private trade will benefit from a more stable market, and the consumer will benefit from the assurance of a reserve supply of food and fiber, available when needed.

Commodities may be withdrawn from the reserve inventories only in cases of genuine emergency, or when the domestic market price of a commodity reaches 110 percent of farm parity, at which time 10 percent of the commodity may be released for sale. When prices reached 120 percent of parity, another 20 percent could be sold; at 130 percent of parity,

another 30 percent could be released; and if market prices reached 140 percent of parity, sales of the reserves would be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. This formula would serve as a consumer protection and effectively insulate the reserve from the normal market as well.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would be required to make an annual report to Congress and the President of its administration of the reserve inventories, and a provision is included which would place the expenses of such reserves where they belong—in the category of national defense.

Briefly, these are the major provisions of the bill which I submit for the consideration of my colleagues today. The need for strategic agricultural commodity reserves is becoming increasingly apparent. The world food and population problems are steadily becoming more severe, and we are squarely in the middle of those problems whether we like it or not. As our carryovers of wheat and feed grains drop, the possibilities of emergencies, whether they be man made or acts of God, become more threatening. The time to plan for these future contingencies is now, while we still have the opportunity.

THE FORGOTTEN FARMER

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Aldwin Strassburg, of Magnolia, Minn., in the Second Congressional District, commenting on the sad plight of farmers today. It certainly sums up the feelings of many rural Americans at the present time, and I include it in the Record at this point in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues. I might add that Mr. Strassburg's analysis first appeared in the Nobles County Review published in Adrian, Minn.

The letter follows:

THE FORGOTTEN FARMER

At the present time the American Farmer is the most unpopular, unwanted and unprotected individual in the world. Yet he is expected to struggle through a drastic era of rising prices on items he has to buy and with no price protection or support on the products he has to sell. When a farmer needs machinery parts, seed, feed, or fertilizer he is told what he has to pay, but when he has something to sell he is told what he will be paid for it. He has no negotiating power whatsoever. Yet, he is expected to sustain his existence and feed the world. He also has to gamble with all the hazards that are inflicted upon him. Crop losses through hail, frost, storms, floods or drought, and disease may ruin him in a single season. Yet he is expected to prosper and exist.

Labor, railroads, trucklines, manufacturers and practically every other business has protection in some form or another. The majority of them have unions that are protected by the government. A manufac-

turer has a set price on what he will receive for his product. The transportation line knows just what he will receive after delivery is made. The laborer knows the size of his check after a week's work, plus benefits. The farmer works without any of this protection.

We have the Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. which we pay taxes to support, but due to inadequate personnel, this department has done more to hinder the farmer than to help him. This office has not been without adequate jurisdiction for only the last five years. Its affairs have been mismanaged for many more than that. I don't believe lawyers and politicians are capable of handling the business of the farmer. It would take someone more experienced and familiar with agriculture. At the present time, the welfare of the farmer and small business man is one of the greatest problems facing us.

If you needed an emergency operation, would you go to a lawyer to have the job done? I am sure you wouldn't. You would go to someone with the knowledge and experience to do the job. Yet a lawyer has no more knowledge and experience in agriculture than he would in performing minor surgery.

True, we have farmers organizations; four major ones in fact—each one with some good points and also some darn poor ones. In fact, we have too many of them. They spend all their time trying to ruin each other instead of working with and for the farmer. Each one is too conceited to join the other. Their good points could be put together to form one good strong union. So far, the only service any farm organization has given the farmer is to collect his dues.

In a recent Minnesota Agriculture publication, Orville Freeman stated that the average, per farmer income was up 16 percent over 1965 and averaged out to \$4,900 per year per farmer. He didn't state how many less farmers we had in 1966 than in 1965. Many young farmers quit after 1965, to go into a more profitable business. Many more were forced to quit. If we had as many people on the farms to share the income from agriculture as we had in 1965, the amount received per farmer and the percentage gain would have both declined sharply.

In the latest issue of Post magazine, on page 28, it is stated that psychiatrists refuse to go into mental and sexual hospitals because they can't earn more than \$18,000 to \$22,000 a year and can make two or three times this much as private practitioners. The psychiatrist has no overhead, no equipment to buy and have depreciate in value, yet he isn't satisfied. This is a far cry from the \$4,900 Freeman expects the farmer to be satisfied with. President Johnson talks big about war against poverty. If we had family sized farms and a program so a farmer could make a living on a family size farm we would be making a great stride forward on the war against poverty. Many of the farmers that are forced to quit become a direct government liability.

As we look back through history, we find that many years ago in Israel the farms were divided into large tracts of land which they called "Kubbutz" after a few years Israel saw that this didn't work and again put their vast population back on small farms so they would have a means of supporting themselves. Russia also divided their agricultural land into large farms which they call "commons". Now they are, again, turning them back into private, individual farms. Today we are following that same pattern in this country. We are calling them "cooperatives". This is forcing thousands of farmers off the land.

Are those in Washington so blind that they cannot see what is happening? Don't we look back in history and see what other countries have experienced by this. Can't we

profit from their experiences? Do we think we are so far superior to them that we can succeed where they have failed?

Let us wake up before it is too late. Let us once again restore reliable, experienced, and capable personnel in the Department of Agriculture and let it function to the full extent of what it was originally intended.

Although agriculture has slipped far from being our leading industry, let us "In Washington" not forget it entirely. Food is still a valuable and essential commodity.

ALDWIN STRASSBURG.

IMPORTATION OF FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FROM MEXICO—U.S. GROWERS NEED PROTECTION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the administration and the Congress terminated the importation of supplemental agricultural workers from Mexico.

Today, with accelerating rapidity, Mexico is exporting cheap fresh fruits and vegetables into the United States.

Whereas, previously our Federal Government permitted the direct importation of labor—paid at the identical wage rate as U.S. residents—now in the form of food products imported into the United States, the Federal Government is permitting, and even encouraging, the importation not only of cheap foreign labor, but also of cheap foreign water, cheap foreign fertilizer, cheap foreign seeds, cheap foreign financing, and cheap foreign materials of all sorts, together with the additional ingredients of cheap foreign land and taxes.

Our farmers and food processors cannot possibly compete with the cheap foreign labor and supplies without lowering our standard of living.

American farmers and food processors will have no alternative to closing down their higher cost operations and moving their families and processing plants to Mexico in order to compete favorably. Such a movement would jeopardize the principal industry in California and would adversely affect many allied industries—such as, fertilizer and seed production, farm machinery manufacturing, food processing equipment manufacturing, trucking, railroading, package manufacturing, advertising and sales.

To illustrate the growing problem, I quote from the April 24, 1967, report of the Federal-State Market News Service of Sacramento, Calif.:

FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FROM MEXICO

Fresh fruit and vegetable shipments to the United States from Mexico during 1966 totaled 21,544 carlots, and continued the upward trend of the past decade, according to the Federal-State Market News Service. This was early 2½ times the volume of ten years ago. Shipments to the United States from Mexico are principally during November to May, when domestic production is at a low ebb. Value of the imports into the United States from Mexico now is about \$50 million.

Fresh market tomatoes were the leading

commodity, with the equivalent of nearly 10,000 carlots shipped into the United States from Mexico in 1966. Cantaloups were second, with over 3,200 cars. Other major volume items for fresh market from Mexico included strawberries, watermelons, cucumbers, onions, peppers, and oranges.

Frozen strawberry imports into the United States from Mexico zoomed to a record high of over 82 million pounds in 1966, a whopping 60 per cent over 1965. Nearly ten years ago frozen strawberry imports from this source totaled only 14 million pounds. Fresh market strawberry imports from Mexico during 1966 were more than double those the previous year.

Winter vegetables can be grown in all irrigated coastal valleys of the west coast of Mexico, from Guaymas to Culiacan, according to reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service. These coastal valleys are only a few feet above sea level. Practically all the commercial production of strawberries, however, is further south, concentrated in the states of Guanajuato and Michoacan, at an elevation of 5,000 to 6,000 feet.

Total U.S. imports of fresh market fruits and vegetables from Mexico by rail, truck, or boat—Car and carlot equivalents

Calendar year:	Amount
1955	5,999
1956	8,168
1957	8,843
1958	14,778
1959	16,682
1960	16,638
1961	12,598
1962	16,492
1963	19,786
1964	19,892
1965	20,878
1966	21,544

Source: Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Shipments, annual reports issued by USDA, C. & M.S. Fruit & Vegetable Division, Market News Branch, Washington, D.C.

Strawberries present an acute problem. Approximately one-fourth of all the commercial strawberries in the United States are grown in my district. The following figures may interest all Members of the House:

U.S. imports of frozen strawberries from Mexico

Calendar year:	Pounds
1959	14,063,000
1960	25,017,000
1961	29,817,000
1962	32,281,000
1963	34,550,000
1964	39,720,000
1965	51,846,000
1966	82,826,000

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. imports of fresh strawberries from Mexico (season November–May)

Season:	Pounds
1958–59	51,000
1959–60	540,000
1960–61	387,000
1961–62	966,000
1962–63	2,449,000
1963–64	3,794,000
1964–65	5,183,000
1965–66	9,778,000

Source: Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

This growing problem affects all fruit and vegetable production in the United States; but because strawberry production is most adversely affected, I have introduced some corrective legislation, H.R. 9070.

This bill will impose import limitations

on prepared or preserved strawberries not to exceed 20 percent of the average annual consumption in the United States.

I hope all Members will recognize and appreciate the problem facing the strawberry growers throughout the United States now, and which can affect all farmers in the immediate future—unless some reasonable balances are achieved quickly. Your support for H.R. 9070 will be appreciated.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Members of this body are vitally concerned about the problem of the disease of alcoholism in America today.

On April 13, 1967, Senators JAVITS, of New York, and MOSS, of Utah, together with 34 other Senators, introduced S. 1508, known as the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967. Their statement on it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, commencing at page 9322. I believe that their bill is worthy of support, and that a united nonpartisan effort should be made for it in the House.

I am joined in this behalf by 21 of my colleagues here in the House.¹ We are taking advantage of the new provision under House Resolution 42 adopted April 25, 1967—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 10708 through 10712—which allows joint sponsorship by up to 25 Members. I am, therefore, pleased that sponsoring the House version of S. 1508 today we have Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. FINO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TENZER, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WALDIE.

We sponsor this legislation, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the need to deal effectively and on a nationwide basis with the country's fourth most serious health problem, alcoholism.

The current Javits-Moss bill is similar

¹ Congressman Hagan has introduced a comprehensive alcoholism bill for the District of Columbia, H.R. 6143. His statement on his most recent bill of national implication is found at Page 11335 of the Congressional Record of May 1, 1967. Representative Gude has introduced his own bill, H.R. 8523.

to the bill I introduced in the 89th Congress on alcoholism.² There are, however, significant improvements in the Javits-Moss bill, including provision for dealing with the alcoholic on medical, instead of criminal terms, in view of recent court decisions which recognize the need for a modern approach to the alcoholic problem. In addition, this legislation calls for a special study project to conduct a coordinated program of research and study of personnel practices and current and projected needs in the field of alcoholism, the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics, and the prevention of alcoholism. The special project also would be concerned with the availability and adequacy of education and training resources of persons entering the alcoholic rehabilitation field, as well as physicians and law enforcement officials who deal with alcoholics.

Our bill, which I include in full at the end of this statement, would establish a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control within the Office of the Surgeon General, to coordinate and direct Federal alcoholism programs. The Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control would provide and administer, through its secretary, grants to fund programs including: demonstration projects for detoxification centers; court-supervised programs for alcoholics; programs for alcoholics who are inmates in correctional institutions; and post-institutional care for alcoholics.

This legislation is designed to implement the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission concerning alcoholism and follows the recommendations of the National Conference on Alcoholism sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1963. It has the approval, among others, of the North American Association of Alcoholism programs, the parent organization for State and local government groups dealing with alcoholism, as well as independent authorities on alcoholism.

In addition, this bill takes cognizance of recent court decisions in the field of alcoholism, and addresses itself to practical considerations which arise as a result of these decisions. For example, the recent and celebrated decision of the U.S. District Court of Appeals in *Dewitt Easter v. District of Columbia*, 361 F. 2d 50 (D.C. Circuit 1966) reversing 209 A. 2d 625 (D.C. Ct. App. 1965) and subsequent decisions, including *Driver v. Hinnant*, 356 F. 2d 761 (4th Circuit 1966) reversing 243 F. Supp. 59 (E.D.N.C. 1965) are strong evidence of the increasing acceptance by the Judiciary of the attitude that habitual alcoholics must be treated medically and socially.³

² In the 89th Congress, I introduced a bill, H.R. 14197, for an "Alcoholism Control Act of 1966," and my statements in connection therewith will be found, among other places, in the daily Congressional Record of June 13, 1966, Page A3173; June 16, 1966, Page A3262; July 26, 1966, Page A3939; August 8, 1966, Page A4166; August 22, 1966, Page A4437; October 4, 1966, Page A5115; February 8, 1967, Page A548; March 7, 1967, Page A1115; March 23, 1967, Page A1524; April 6, 1967, Page A1669, and April 10, 1967, Page A1695.

³ For an analysis of these and other recent decisions in the field, see the daily Congressional Record of March 23, 1967, at Page

October 17, 1966, the U.S. Supreme Court refused certiorari in *Budd v. California*, 385 U.S. 909, 17 L. ed. 2d 138 (1966), where the California Supreme Court refused to deny application of a State statute to an alcoholic as violative of the eighth amendment of the Federal Constitution which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. The California statute provides, in part, that any person "found in any public place under the influence of intoxicating liquor, in such a condition that he is unable to exercise care for his own safety or that of others" is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Justice Fortas' dissent, however, may be interpreted as a red flag warning that eventually the holdings of *Easter* and *Hinnant* can receive nationwide application. Addressing himself to the facts in *Budd* against California, Justice Fortas said in his dissent at page 909:

The trial record squarely presents the issue whether alcoholism is, as a matter of law, a defense to the charge.

It is time for this Court to decide whether persons suffering from the illness of alcoholism and exhibiting its symptoms or effects may be punished criminally therefor. The Court has already held that a State may not punish for narcotics addiction, that to do so would violate the constitutional prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. *Robinson v. California*, 370 US 660, 8 L. ed. 2d 758, 82 S. Ct. 1417 (1962).

... We should hear argument in the present case to consider whether it presents a situation which commands similar constitutional proscription.

Each of the 50 States has some sort of non-criminal procedure for dealing with alcoholics, and in each State some procedure exists or can be provided for intelligent, purposeful handling of the various aspects of the problem.

The use of the crude and formidable weapon of criminal punishment of the alcoholic is neither seemly nor sensible, neither purposeful nor civilized.

Justice Douglas joined Justice Fortas in the dissenting opinion:

... believing that being an alcohol addict, like being a drug addict, is beyond the reach of the criminal law for the reasons stated in his separate opinion in *Robinson v. California*, 370 US 660, 668, 8 L. ed. 758, 764, 82 S. Ct. 1417.

As a result of these decisions new responsibilities have been placed upon the States and communities, as well as the Federal Government, to deal with the alcoholic as a sick person in need of medical treatment by doctors, rather than as a criminal by law enforcement officials.

While more than half the States have taken the legislative step of recognizing alcoholism as a medical problem, and have appropriated some money for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics, the magnitude of the problem has simply been more than the States can individually handle. The bill we have introduced today authorizes \$20 million in fiscal 1968 for implementation of the programs previously outlined. In addition, the special study project on per-

A1524, containing, among other things, an article entitled "Is the Alcoholic Immune from Criminal Prosecution?" by Peter Barton Hutt and Richard A. Merrill, which appeared in the December 1966 issue of the *Legal Aid Briefcase*, Volume XXV, No. 2, at Page 70.

sonnel practices and current and projected needs in the field of alcoholism mentioned earlier is funded at \$500,000 in fiscal 1968 and \$800,000 in fiscal 1969.

These expenditures are modest when one realizes that to some 5 million Americans, drinking alcoholic beverages has become enough of a problem to substantially interfere with their leading successful happy lives, and that, in addition, some 250,000 persons become alcoholics each year. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, in a report to the President on alcoholism, October 20, 1966, said that the burden of the approximately 5 million Americans who are alcoholics is not carried by them alone. He stated:

It directly—and often tragically—affects between 16 and 20 million members of their families.

In other words, as many as 25 million Americans—one out of every eight of our citizens—live with the problem of alcoholism, either as alcoholics or as members of their family.

Alcoholism, in addition to being the country's fourth most serious health problem, ranking behind only heart disease, mental illness and cancer, produces disastrous effects which are not easily reflected or appreciated by a perusal of alcoholic statistics. For example, it is a well recognized fact that alcoholism, unless arrested, can drastically shorten lives. Alcoholics generally suffer a death rate of two-and-one-half times that of the normal population.

Alcoholism is regarded as a progressive disease. Before health is completely destroyed, chronic drunkenness on the part of the mother or father, or both, usually leads to the loss of a job. Shortly thereafter, although statistics often fail to show it, there occurs an entire breakdown of the family unit.

Aside from the social and health aspects of alcoholism, the public bears an increased tax burden as a result of the plight of the alcoholic. The President's Commission on Crime recently issued a report entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society" which stated that in 1965 one out of every three of the some 2 million arrests in America were for public drunkenness,⁴ thereby placing a burden on the courts, police and penal system to bear the administration expenses occasioned by the alcoholic problem. Moreover, alcoholism can be traced to many of the auto accidents in the United States, according to Dr. Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs. Alcoholism is also extremely costly, considering the loss of valuable business and industry personnel and about \$432 million annually as a result of absenteeism, inefficiencies and industrial accidents due to alcoholism. The list of detrimental effects of this dreadful disease is great.

This bill speaks to the present need for a nationwide program requiring Federal, State and local action. It presents a challenge to this body to take urgent action to deal effectively with an extremely serious national health problem. Last

⁴ President's Commission on Crime Report, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, Chapter 9, Page 233, February 19, 1967.

year this body accepted its responsibility by enacting legislation to combat the problem of narcotics. Now the time has come for the Congress to deal with a problem even more severe in terms of the number of our people detrimentally affected. The bill we join together today to introduce is realistic and sound. I strongly urge its immediate and thoughtful consideration.

There follows a copy of the bill we have introduced today:

[In the House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session]

H.R. 9643

(By Mr. Kupferman (for himself, Mr. Adabbo, Mr. Bell, Mr. Button, Mr. Conte, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Fino, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hanley, Mr. McClory, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Reifel, Mr. Reinecke, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Tenzer, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Vander Jagt, and Mr. Waldie) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on —.)

A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that alcoholism is a major national health problem which requires action by and cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments.

(b) (1) In view of (i) the recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, (ii) recent court decisions holding that habitual alcoholics must be treated medically and socially which place new responsibilities and burdens upon the States and communities as well as upon the Federal Government, and (iii) demands for increased numbers of specialized personnel to deal with problems of alcoholism and alcoholics, the Congress further finds and declares that both new and improved techniques must be developed and put into operation with respect to problems posed by alcoholism, its prevention, its treatment, and its control.

(2) The Congress further declares that, in addition to the funds provided for in this Act to combat that problem of alcoholism, it is the policy of the Congress that funds available to carry out other Federal legislation providing for Federal or federally assisted research, prevention, treatment, or rehabilitation programs in the fields of health and disease shall also be utilized to help eradicate alcoholism as a major health problem.

(c) Therefore it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Act to assist in devising and placing in operation both new and improved approaches to the problem of the prevention and control of alcoholism and the treatment, care, and rehabilitation of alcoholics, by providing for the conduct of appropriate study, research, experimentation, and the creation of appropriate demonstration projects.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established, within the Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), to be headed by a Director.

(b) It shall be the duty and function of the Bureau to—

(1) administer the grant programs authorized by this Act;

(2) direct basic research and studies on

the causes, prevention, and treatment of alcoholism;

(3) serve as a clearinghouse for information and data related to alcoholism;

(4) coordinate activities carried on by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with respect to alcoholism;

(5) assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the discharge of any of his responsibilities which are concerned with or relevant to alcoholism, the prevention or control thereof, or the treatment, cure, or rehabilitation of alcoholics; and

(6) provide technical assistance to State and local governments with respect to the establishment and implementation of programs and procedures for dealing effectively with alcoholism, and for providing for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics.

GRANTS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 4. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations for the purpose of assisting such agencies and organizations in establishing and operating, as demonstration projects—

(1) detoxification centers;

(2) treatment and rehabilitation centers for alcoholics which are authorized under State or local law to receive, treat, and rehabilitate, individuals who have been charged with an offense, under State or local law, and have been ordered or paroled by a court of competent jurisdiction to undergo treatment and care at such centers;

(3) treatment programs for alcoholics who are inmates of correctional institutions; and

(4) programs for postinstitutional services for alcoholics.

(b) Grants made under this section shall be made so as to—

(1) accord preference to those projects which have the greatest promise of a substantial contribution to combating the problems of alcoholism;

(2) insure an equitable distribution of the funds available for such grants throughout the various geographic areas of the United States, considering the relative populations of each such area as compared to that of all such areas, the relative extent to which alcoholism and problems stemming therefrom exist in each of such areas as compared to that of all such areas, and the relative need of each of such areas for assistance in combating alcoholism and the problems stemming therefrom in each of such areas as compared to that of all such areas.

(c) For the purpose of enabling the Director to make the grants authorized by this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY PROJECTS IN ALCOHOLIC REHABILITATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants for carrying out a coordinated program of research and study of (1) personnel practices and current and projected personnel needs in the field of alcoholism (including its prevention, control, treatment, and the rehabilitation of alcoholics), (2) the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources of individuals in, or preparing to enter such field, and (3) the availability and adequacy of specialized training for persons, such as physicians and law enforcement officials, who have occasion to deal with alcoholics, and the extent to which such persons make the best use of their professional qualifications when dealing with alcoholics.

(b) (1) Such grants may be made to one or more organizations, but only on condition that the organization will undertake and conduct, or if more than one organization is to receive such grants, only on the condition

that such organizations have agreed among themselves to undertake and conduct, a coordinated program of research into and study of all the aspects of the resources, needs, practices, and other matters referred to in subsection (a).

(2) Any grant made under subsection (a) shall be made on the condition that the research and study for which such grant is made must be completed not later than two years from the date the coordinated program referred to in subsection (a) is commenced.

(3) As used in paragraph (1), the term "organization" means a nongovernmental agency, organization, or commission, composed of representatives of leading professional associations, organizations, or agencies active in the fields directly related to dealing with alcoholism or the problems stemming therefrom (directly or indirectly).

(c) Upon completion of the research and study authorized by subsection (a), the Director shall, on the basis of such research and study, prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress a full and complete report setting forth the findings revealed as a result of such research and study together with any recommendations of the Director with respect to how the problems brought about by alcoholism may be dealt with more effectively.

(d) For the purpose of enabling the Director to make the grants authorized by this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(e) In addition to the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (c) for the purpose of making grants under this section, the Director is authorized to accept and utilize, for such purpose, any other amounts which may be contributed by public or private sources to assist in carrying out such purpose.

PROTECTION OF PERSONAL RIGHTS OF ALCOHOLICS

SEC. 6. In making grants, entering into contracts, or in engaging in other activities to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director shall take such steps as may be necessary to assure that no individual shall be made the subject of any research which is carried out (in whole or in part) with funds provided under this Act unless such individual explicitly agrees to become the subject of such research.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL

SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism Care and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee") which shall consist of eighteen members, to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. Members of the Advisory Committee shall be selected from persons who are not otherwise in the full-time employ of the United States and who are skilled in medicine, psychology, government, law enforcement, social work, public health, or education, or who have demonstrated particular interest in the special problems of alcoholism. At least three members of the Advisory Committee shall be persons who are involved in State or local government programs related to alcoholism and at least three members shall be persons who are involved in programs of local government agencies or private, nonprofit agencies which are related to alcoholism.

(2) Each member of the Advisory Committee shall hold office for a term of three years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the

terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, six at the end of the first year, six at the end of the second year, and six at the end of the third year, after the date of appointment. A member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) It shall be the function of the Advisory Committee to advise and consult with the Director with respect to the administration of this Act, to review and approve grant programs authorized by this Act, and advise with and consult appropriate persons with respect to any other program carried out or supported by the Federal Government with respect to alcoholism and the problems related thereto.

(d) The Advisory Committee shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress a report containing its findings and recommendations with respect to programs related to meeting the problems of alcoholism, and the adequacy of such programs. In addition, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the President and to Congress such interim reports as it considers appropriate.

(e) The Advisory Committee is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Committee such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance as such Committee may require to carry out its functions.

REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES PRIOR TO MAKING GRANTS

SEC. 8. In order to assure that Federal efforts in combating the problem of alcoholism will be properly coordinated with like efforts on the part of State and local governments, no grant under this Act for any project or study to be carried on in any State shall be made until any State and local public agency officially concerned with the problem of alcoholism in and for the area within which such project or study is proposed to be carried on shall have first been advised of, and consulted about, such grant. The views and recommendations of any such agency with respect to any grant shall be accorded full consideration by the Director in determining whether, when, and under what conditions, such grant will be made.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this Act—
(a) The term "alcoholic" means any person who chronically and habitually uses or is dependent upon alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost power of self control with respect to use of such beverages, or who by reason of alcoholism endangers the health, safety, or welfare of himself or others.

(b) The term "alcoholic beverages" includes alcoholic spirits, liquors, wines, beer, and every liquid or fluid, patented or not, containing alcoholic spirits, wine or beer which is capable of being consumed by human beings and produces intoxication in any form or in any degree.

(c) The term "alcoholism" means any condition of abnormal behavior or illness result-

ing directly or indirectly from the chronic and habitual use of or dependence upon alcoholic beverages to the extent of loss of power of self-control over their use.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for the legislation which he and other Members, including myself, have introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to a Federal legislative program on alcoholism, and to serve as a sponsor of the proposed Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967 which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] has discussed.

In addition to being a major health problem, the intemperate use of alcohol contributes substantially to the death toll on our highways and to the high incidence of crime in our Nation. Studies have also revealed that excessive use of alcohol contributes to many of our broken homes and to the high divorce rate.

Alcoholism with its complex and always disastrous effect on our society is indeed a national problem which requires a national solution.

I do not believe that Federal action will disclose a single or simple answer. The physical and psychological effects of alcohol on individuals suggest a many-sided approach to the problem.

It is interesting to observe that one of the most successful programs against alcoholism is Alcoholics Anonymous. Basic to the program, as I understand it, is an innate belief in a higher power—and a reliance upon this power as an unlimited source of strength to release the addicted individual from his reliance upon alcohol.

In cosponsoring a new Federal approach to the problem of alcoholism, we should not lose sight of the value of existing private programs, including Alcoholics Anonymous. We should also take note of the many religious and nonprofit agencies working earnestly to heal many alcoholics of their addiction.

Mr. Speaker, recently in my home district in Illinois, the Lake County Council on Alcoholism was formed. The establishment of this organization in the Lake County area is made necessary because of the increase in alcoholism. Many public-spirited citizens have interested themselves in the Lake County Council on Alcoholism and some have become officers and members of the board of directors of this organization—Mr. R. Bruce Wight is its president, Mrs. M. E. Amstutz serves as secretary, and Mr. Cyril J. Rakauskas is executive director. I am proud to be a member of the board of the Lake County Council on Alcoholism.

The council has already begun its work which includes discussions of the problem of alcoholism on radio programs and in the press. The organization is also conducting a pilot educational pro-

gram in one of Waukegan's industrial plants.

The enactment of the legislation which has been introduced today would greatly increase the opportunity for service of the Lake County Council on Alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that early hearings can be held on the legislation which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] and I, and many others are sponsoring; and which he so eloquently described in his remarks on the floor.

In seeking through legislation to help develop better communities and a better Nation, I can think of no measure of greater importance than the bill which has inspired this discussion on the floor of the House today—the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's joining in this nonpartisan venture. I know of the work the gentleman has done in the field of narcotics. I hope that some of his ability which was given to that field will be available to us in connection with the subject of alcoholism.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend our honorable colleague from New York for his efforts in establishing ways this country can better control the problems of alcoholism.

Since 1955 Arkansas has had a Commission on Alcoholism. The Arkansas Commission is composed of seven members. One member is a clergyman, one is a wholesale or retail dealer in alcohol beverages, one is a doctor, two are cured of the disease, and the others are outstanding citizens known to have an interest in the problem.

Dr. Ed Wheat, the member of the Arkansas Commission with the greatest tenure said:

Education about the seriousness of this problem is the most important problem we have on the state level.

The doctor also said that a serious problem for State commissions was in convincing people suffering from the disease that they are sick. He also feels that the increased amount of leisure time will see an increased incidence of this disease.

These comments by the doctor also show that this problem is very serious and is likely to become more serious.

At the present time, Alcoholics Anonymous appears to be the best tool we have for combating this problem. But, as has been observed here today and as Dr. Wheat has observed, we must expand our educational effort in terms of teaching people about the possible and likely adverse effects of alcoholism.

Arkansas has realized the seriousness of this problem and has been working to combat the disease. The approach has been practical and has been helpful. But, like many other programs it has been limited by a lack of funds to do the job properly. The desire to meet this need is present in Arkansas. I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this discussion and acknowledge the leadership my friend from New York has shown in bringing this matter before the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON—THE GRAND OLD CAMPAIGNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a close and dear friend, a man whom I have known and respected through all my political career, a man who devoted his life to the Republican Party and whose service in that party spanned four decades.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of my good friend Victor A. Johnston leaves a gap that will be difficult to fill in the Republican Party. An adopted son of my own State who came to Wisconsin initially in 1944 to run Harold Stassen's presidential delegate campaign, "Vic" soon thereafter became executive secretary of the State voluntary Republican committee under our mutually good friend, the late and beloved Tom Coleman.

As executive secretary, "Vic" helped me as a freshman State Senator right after I had been elected to fill the seat left vacant by my own father's death. "Vic" was a great teacher and I will always remember and appreciate the help he gave me at the beginning of my political career.

"Vic" Johnston originally came from North Dakota where he got his start in politics. It was in that State that he got his first political assignment, as manager of Herbert Hoover's campaign in the eastern half of North Dakota in 1928.

In the early 1930's Victor Johnston migrated to Minneapolis, Minn., where he wound up working for Harold Stassen's campaign for Governor in 1938.

After Tom Coleman drafted "Vic" as executive secretary for Wisconsin's voluntary Republican committee in 1944, he served in that capacity for exactly 2 years and then joined freshman Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in Washington as his administrative assistant.

Soon thereafter, "Vic" became staff director for the Republican senatorial campaign committee here in Washington, a post he held for most of the next 20 years until shortly before his death in Miami in March 1967.

Mr. Speaker, Vic Johnston was a Republican's Republican throughout his more than 40 years in GOP politics. As Dave Broder, the noted political commentator and columnist for the Washington Post put it so well:

He served an incredible variety of people—Harold Stassen, Bob Taft, McCarthy, Barry Goldwater, Thruston Morton and Dick Nixon—and if he had a political philosophy of his own, he never argued it.

Mr. Speaker, all who knew Victor Johnston during his long and distin-

guished career of service to the Republican Party knew a man who was a good technician, a sound advisor, a successful fundraiser, and, above all else, a real teamplayer.

The highlights of "Vic" Johnston's life are contained in several brief articles which appeared in the Nation's press. Dave Broder, in his column of March 21, faithfully captured, in my opinion, some of the true flavor of the man who, in Dave's words, "was probably not known even to the careful newspaper readers of the past two decades, but he was prized by the men in politics and those of us who cover them."

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I ask that the Dave Broder column of March 21, the Milwaukee Journal article of March 16, the Milwaukee Sentinel article of the same date and the New York Times account of March 17 be placed in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, Victor Johnston was known to most politicians on both sides of the aisle not only in the Senate where his formal duties lay but also in the House of Representatives where many of us have had occasion to consult with him, to socialize with him, and in general to enjoy the pleasure of his company.

I was privileged to serve as a pallbearer at Vic's funeral at the request of his beloved wife, Margaret. Although Margaret and her three children know of my deep sympathy at their loss, I would once again like to take this public opportunity to express my sincere condolences at the loss of a beloved husband and father.

The articles referred to above follow: [From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1967]

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

(By David S. Broder)

This space is borrowed today from matters of conceivably greater consequence for a personal reminiscence. A good friend, Victor A. Johnston, died last week and he deserves more than the inadequate farewell this column affords.

Vic was probably not known even to the careful newspaper readers of the past two decades, but he was prized by the men in politics and those of us who cover them.

Probably it was because of his unending delight in the infinite variety of human beings—and the damned-fool, unexpected things they say and do in the stress of political campaigns. Vic saw and knew more of the political figures of the past generation than most of us did. He was 66 when he died. He came out of North Dakota in the 1930s, got involved in Republican politics in Minnesota and Wisconsin, came to Washington with the late Joe McCarthy and for most of the last 20 years had been running the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee.

He served an incredible variety of people—Harold Stassen, Bob Taft, McCarthy, Barry Goldwater, Thruston Morton and Dick Nixon—and if he had a political philosophy of his own, he never argued it. Politics to Vic was not the struggle of good against evil; it was the best of all indoor and outdoor sports, one which demanded the greatest skill of the contestants and one which guaranteed the spectators both thrills and laughs.

I cannot testify as to his political skill. He probably elected some Republicans over the years who could never have made it by their own meager talents, and his advice probably helped defeat some others.

He raised a whale of a lot of money for the Republican Party, some of it by means

and from sources that were his exclusive knowledge and which his principals on the campaign committee were just as glad not to know about.

Though his services and loyalties were to the GOP, his friendships were bipartisan. Encountering Hubert Humphrey outside the Senate before the 1964 convention he offered to help Humphrey win the Democratic vice presidential nomination, because "I'm getting damned sick and tired of trying to beat you for Senator." He was immensely delighted when President Johnson—an old friend from Senate days—invited him to the White House one day for a bill-signing ceremony in the Rose Garden. When Vic told the story, he always noted that he had never made it to the White House during the eight years President Eisenhower was there. Like most professional politicians, Vic was able to control his enthusiasm for Mr. Eisenhower.

He was a superb storyteller. At Republican National Committee meetings or political conventions, he loved to gather his reporter and politician friends in his room for a spread of Wisconsin cheese, beer and booze—and hours of yarn-swapping. It is a tragedy that no one ever strapped him into a chair, turned on a tape recorder and forced him to set down his reminiscences for history. But as long as his friends survive, his tales will be a part of the political talk.

I last saw him at the \$500-a-plate Republican Gala at the Washington Hilton two weeks ago, going down the line at the somewhat skimpy and improvised buffet that had been set up in the press room. It was characteristic of Vic that, though he had sold as many tickets as anybody for the million-dollar affair, he chose to scrounge his own supper with the press, rather than sit with the "fat cats" next door.

It was typical, too, that he had a quip designed to mock the Republicans' own stuffiness and at the same time to deflate any sense of injured dignity the reporters might be suffering by their exclusion from the dining hall.

"We're willing to put up with you -----s at the reception," he said, "but we're not so hard up we have to let you eat dinner with us rich folks."

Vic could abide almost anything in a human being except a solemn ass. He knew the politicians and Presidents of his era—to say nothing of the reporters—far too well to think that any of them were made of anything but very common clay. But if he was cynical enough not to take any of them at their own evaluation of themselves, he was charitable enough to let the worst of us know that we were not beyond redemption in his eyes.

He would take the newest cub reporter on the beat into his confidence—as he did this one—just as easily as he would tell the most self-exalted party potentate to go to hell.

An old friend of Vic, Jack Mills, tells me that Vic met H. L. Mencken at least once. I think he would have liked the epitaph Mencken suggested for himself:

"If, after I depart this vale, you ever remember me and have thought to please my ghost, forgive some sinner and wink your eye at some homely girl."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1967]
VICTOR JOHNSTON OF G.O.P. DIES; SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN UNIT AIDE

MIAMI, March 15.—Victor A. Johnston, field director of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, died in Mercy Hospital Wednesday night after a heart attack. His age was 66. He had become ill in Washington on Sunday and flew to Miami the next day to join his wife at their Key Biscayne home.

ACTIVE BEHIND THE SCENES

For most of his adult life, Mr. Johnston was a behind-the-scenes professional politician. He aided the political careers of Harold E.

Stassen, Joseph R. McCarthy, Robert A. Taft, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Barry Goldwater.

Mr. Johnston, who was given much credit for the strong support won by Mr. Stassen in the 1948 contest for the Presidential nomination, was appointed campaign director of the Republican's National Committee in 1949.

He had worked his way up in the party, becoming well-known in Minnesota and Wisconsin in the 1930's and 1940's.

Mr. Johnston was born on a farm near Inkster, N.D. He was on the debating and baseball teams at the University of North Dakota, which he left before receiving a degree. He served with the Army in France during World War I.

Mr. Johnston moved to Washington in 1922. There he served on the Capitol police staff and, for five years, served as Washington correspondent for Editor and Publisher, the newspaper industry trade paper.

Later he worked for the Northeast Grain Association in Minneapolis and as publicity director for the Minnesota Republican Committee. He managed Mr. Stassen's campaign for Governor in 1938, and when Mr. Stassen was elected he became state publicity director.

In 1946 Mr. Johnston joined Senator McCarthy's administrative staff in Washington, but in 1948 he took a leave to direct Mr. Stassen's campaign for the G.O.P. Presidential nomination, which was won by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York. Mr. Johnston then served as director of volunteers for Mr. Dewey and his running mate, Gov. Earl Warren of California.

In 1951 he organized Senator Taft's drive for the Republican nomination, but when General Eisenhower became the delegates' choice he worked for his election.

In 1954, Mr. Johnston again worked for Senator McCarthy in Minnesota, in a campaign noted for its exhortation of the then Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. In 1961, he planned speaking dates for Senator Goldwater, who was then an "unofficial" candidate for his party's Presidential nomination.

From 1949 until his death, Mr. Johnston held the title of field director of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee.

He leaves his wife, the former Margaret Wilbur Landt; a son, Robert, and two daughters, Mrs. Lucky Somers and Miss Judith Ann Johnston. A funeral service will be held in Washington Saturday.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Mar. 16, 1967]

JOHNSTON, GOP AIDE, DIES

MIAMI, Fla.—Victor A. Johnston, 66, field director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and former party official in Wisconsin, died in a hospital here Wednesday night after a heart attack.

Johnston, who became ill in Washington, D.C., Sunday night, flew to Miami Monday and was taken from the plane by ambulance to Mercy hospital.

He regained consciousness, but did not survive a second heart attack.

Mrs. Johnston, who had been staying in their Key Biscayne home, and members of the family were at Johnston's bedside.

Funeral services for the veteran political strategist of the GOP are expected to be held in Washington, D.C., Saturday.

Johnston gained national attention during the 1948 presidential campaign when he was delegated by the Republicans to follow President Harry S. Truman around the country, to report what Truman was saying in his speeches and the kind of crowds he was attracting.

At one point, Truman invited his "shadow" to come up on the stage with him and be introduced to the Democratic audience, but Johnston declined.

Born in Inkster, N.D., Johnston was a student at the University of North Dakota from 1921 to 1923. On leaving the university, he became editor and publisher of a weekly

newspaper, the Red River Valley Citizen, in Grand Forks.

He got his first official GOP position in 1944 when he was named executive secretary for the Republican party of Wisconsin.

Two years later, he went to Washington to become administrative assistant to Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

In 1949, Johnston became campaign director of the national Republican senatorial committee, a position he held until his death.

Besides his widow, Johnston is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Peggy Somers and Judith Ann Johnston, and a son, Robert.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 16, 1967]

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Victor A. Johnston, 66, one of the Republican party's shrewdest professionals, died Wednesday night in Miami after suffering two heart attacks.

The white maned Johnston, known as the "silver fox" of Wisconsin and national politics, had flown to Miami after appearing, apparently in good health, at the Gridiron dinner here Saturday night and the Gridiron reception Sunday evening.

He became ill here and was removed from an airplane in Miami and taken to Mercy hospital there for treatment. Funeral services will be held here Saturday.

The veteran of many Republican campaigns in Wisconsin and throughout the nation, Johnston held the official title of field director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

OPTIMISTIC ON 1968

He was a grass roots campaigner and a familiar figure at the national conventions of his party, for whom Johnston's principal job was to elect and re-elect Republican senators. With his customary enthusiasm, he had talked confidently Saturday night of increasing the Republican representation in the Senate in next year's elections.

Johnston, who liked to refer to himself as a political "technician," was one of the deadliest sharpshooters in politics. This stemmed from his intimate association with the biggest names in the business.

A native of North Dakota, Johnston got his start in politics as the 19 year old manager of the campaign of Maude Adams, whom he succeeded in having elected as register of deeds at Grand Forks.

In 1928, Johnston handled his first big political assignment—managing Herbert Hoover's campaign in the eastern half of North Dakota. He went to Washington with a North Dakota congressman and was on the Capitol police force for four years.

Returning to Grand Forks, he was editor and publisher of the Red River Valley Citizen.

Migrating to Minneapolis, Johnston handled publicity for the Northwest Grain association and then drifted into political press agency. He worked for Harold Stassen when Stassen ran for governor of Minnesota in 1938 and became press agent for the state of Minnesota as well as for Stassen.

Johnston was introduced to Wisconsin politics when he ran Stassen's presidential delegate campaign in 1944.

DRAFTED BY COLEMAN

This threw him into contact with the late Thomas E. (Boss) Coleman, then the state voluntary Republican chairman of Wisconsin.

Coleman quickly recognized Johnston's talents and drafted him to help run state Republican politics as executive secretary of the voluntary committee.

When Joseph R. McCarthy was elected senator in 1946, Johnston went to Washington as his administrative assistant. This placed the boy from North Dakota squarely in the middle of big time politics.

In fact, with his distinguished shock of white hair, he looked more like a senator than McCarthy and was mistaken for the

senator by the late Sen. Robert A. Taft when Taft met the two for the first time.

In 1948, Johnston returned to Wisconsin to handle another Stassen presidential delegate campaign. Stassen won a majority of the Wisconsin delegation, and when Thomas E. Dewey won the Republican nomination, Stassen offered his organization to the New York governor.

Dewey took only Johnston, placing him in charge of the Dewey-Warren clubs.

In that campaign, Johnston trailed President Truman by plane to the far west and back. Making sarcastic allusions to the Republican sleuth in his audience, the president made Johnston nationally known by pointing him out in the crowds and inviting him to board the presidential campaign train if he paid his fare. Johnston turned down the invitations.

HEADED GOP COMMITTEE

After Dewey's defeat by Truman, Johnston was named director of a revitalized national Republican senatorial campaign committee. Returning temporarily to presidential politics in 1952 at Coleman's request, he was field manager for Taft.

Johnston was successful in winning Taft delegates in Wisconsin, South Dakota and Nebraska, but Dwight D. Eisenhower won the nomination, and Johnston went back to his old job with the senatorial committee.

Johnston was a participant in the presidential campaigns of his close friends Richard Nixon and Barry Goldwater.

Johnston is survived by his wife; a son, Robert, and two daughters, Mrs. Peggy Somers and Judith Ann Johnston.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, all of us on Capitol Hill have lost a friend, a man who made an unusual imprint on Washington and the country. Victor Johnston was not well known to anyone but the professional politician and those who are drawn into the political orbit. But he possessed in great abundance the most desirable of human qualities—the natural ability to make friends and influence people. He also exhibited rare ability to raise party funds.

Vic Johnston was executive director of the Republican senatorial committee. In that role he became invaluable to his party's officeseekers and officeholders, and to the newsmen who covered their activities. Vic moved among the political figures of two generations. He was highly regarded by men in both political parties and by the press. He was savvy, and he leveled with the press. There can be no greater tribute for a party professional.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to what has been said here in tribute to the late Victor A. Johnston. Unfortunately, it is not until we lose a friend or colleague that we are brought to an awareness of his true worth. Unfortunately, too, it is not until the hour has become too late that we express our appreciation. This is particularly true for those, like Vic Johnston, who work behind the scenes and seek no glory for themselves but give unselfishly of their talents helping others to positions of glory and fame.

Vic Johnston devoted his life to our Republican Party. He may be said to be a professional politician. We have all too few like him; skilled and experienced in political affairs, and loyal to our party. No one that I know, in or out of public office, has contributed more loyally and more substantially to Republicanism.

It should be emphasized that he who serves his political party likewise serves

his country. The success of our form of government depends upon the people making decisions as between competing party leaders, and as between political party policies and principles. Vic Johnston devoted his life in this competition seeking to clarify issues and to advance his party's principles in which he sincerely believed.

He never stooped to conquer. His adversaries admired and respected him. He will long be remembered by all of us.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged indeed to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of the finest gentlemen who ever graced our Capital City—Vic Johnston—a stalwart fighter for the Republican cause.

Loyal, dedicated, hard-working, Vic Johnston relentlessly fought for basic Republican principles of free enterprise, individual initiative, and human dignity. He strove for these ideals and labored mightily to direct them to the best national interest.

A gentleman of integrity and outstanding character, he won the respect of all who had the privilege and honor of coming into contact with him. He will be missed.

I offer my deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Victor Johnston, whom I have had the pleasure and honor to know closely over the years.

Few men have had the opportunity to participate in the Nation's political history as did Vic. Few men have grasped the opportunity, met head-on the challenges, and retained the respect and admiration of those in politics on both sides of the aisle as he did.

Our Republican Party is deeply indebted to Vic Johnston for his many years of faithful service. He was dedicated, tenacious, inventive, and tough. He carried a powerful weapon at all times—a devastating sense of humor and a perspective that helped place the problems of the present in the context of the political past.

Vic Johnston served the Republican Party in several capacities. He knew the quiet satisfaction of triumph and the cold ashes of defeat. He was a realist and transmitted this sense of reality to those he met and dealt with. From coast to coast, his corncob pipe and flying shock of snowy hair were a hallmark of the Senate Republican campaign committee.

Vic's stories were legendary—and most carried the bite of truth. He was effective in his own quiet way, extremely witty, and above all, a gentleman. We can but express appreciation for having him among us—and the gratitude of our Grand Old Party for his career in its behalf.

We will all miss the grand old campaigner in the years ahead and in the battles yet to be fought.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1967, I lost a valued friend and counselor, and my party lost an extremely qualified, dedicated, tireless, professional worker. Victor A. Johnston never held elective office, but devoted many years of his life rendering service to those in office or aspiring to public office. Vic

was a modest, self-effacing gentleman who shunned the limelight.

In 1949, Vic Johnston took over as director of the Republican Senatorial campaign committee. He worked diligently and effectively in that post. Vic served as director-organizer of my father's "Taft for President Committee"—1951-52. He went on to support every Republican candidate and to do his utmost for his party's candidates. Vic Johnston was above all—loyal, to himself, to his party, and to his country.

I join my colleagues in the House and Senate who are paying tribute to the late Victor A. Johnston.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the Republican Party lost a loyal and dedicated servant with the passing of Victor Angus Johnston on March 15.

His long and faithful service to his country and the party ranged from duty with the Capitol Police force in 1923 to director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee; the position he held at the point of his untimely death.

In the interim, Mr. Speaker, Vic Johnston's distinguished career included attendance at the University of North Dakota, service with the Army in France in World War I, a newspaper editor and publisher, director of the Minnesota Tourist Bureau, publicity director of the Federal Farm Board, executive secretary of the Republican State committee in Wisconsin, and administrative assistant to the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

In addition, he held key State and national positions in numerous presidential campaigns, including those of Harold Stassen, Thomas Dewey, Bob Taft, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Barry Goldwater. At the time of his death, he was actively serving the Republican Party as director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

A man of dedication and strong convictions, Vic Johnston's loyalty to the Republican Party and to Republican principles was unbending in both good times and bad. He possessed those unique political qualities of loyalty, driving energy, and a keen mind, and the results of his efforts were always a tribute to his desire to do the best job possible. His beloved family, his friends, and those who knew him mourn his passing.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my distinguished Wisconsin colleague, Mr. LAIRD, in paying tribute to Vic Johnston.

The political parties of this country have suffered a great loss with the passing of Vic Johnston. While it is true that the Republican Party is the party to which he devoted many years of dedicated service, both parties are the better for his high-minded, honest dedication.

His service both to the Republican Party of Wisconsin and the senatorial campaign committee will be long remembered.

I join my colleagues in extending my deepest condolences to Mr. Johnston's family.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with those who are taking this time to pay tribute to Vic Johnston.

Most of us on the Republican side of

the aisle felt a keen personal loss when Vic Johnston left us. It was my privilege to work closely with Vic in the 1964 senatorial campaign, and I shall always appreciate the opportunity it gave me to know him.

Vic had a combination of rare talents that are seldom found in individuals in any field of endeavor. He brought to the political arena a combination of technical competence, a great sense of humor and an understanding of his fellow man.

Although for the many years he labored in the political vineyard, the Republicans did not enjoy very many periods of majority leadership in Congress, some of the victories for which he was responsible have added luster to the pages of history.

The Republican Party will miss him. His friends in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, will miss him, and America loses a fine political leader.

Perhaps the following lines sum up, in some small measure, the creed of men like Vic Johnston whose lives are devoted to serving.

Calvary, the shadows hastened the end of day

And those near the Master heard Him say,
"It is finished," He bowed His head,
The soldiers muttered, "He is dead,"
Now I, trying to follow in the Master's way,
Lift up my eyes and to my Father say,
"My life is thine, take it, Oh God,
That another's path may be less hard to tread."

If I can stoop to lift or ease one single pain,
Or utter one word of beauty that shall live again,

Then I may say, when at last I stand alone,
"It is finished, Father, I am coming home."

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] in paying tribute to our friend, the late Vic Johnston.

His 18 years with the Republican senatorial campaign committee constitute a fitting climax to an illustrious lifetime of service to his Nation. Prior to coming to Washington, Vic was the executive director of the Republican Party in Wisconsin. We in Minnesota have a claim on him, too. Vic Johnston used his energies and considerable talents in developing the tourist industry in our beautiful and scenic State. It was really but a short jump from his farm home in North Dakota to the city life in neighboring Minnesota.

Vic Johnston was a personal friend to many of our Nation's great citizens, and many of them became great through the effective efforts by Vic, who had a knack for offering just the right advice for young politicians on the way up.

The party has lost a tireless and faithful worker. The Nation has lost a devoted servant.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying a special tribute to the late Vic Johnston, director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and a former executive director of the Republican Party in Wisconsin. In the years that I have known Vic Johnston, I admired his political acumen, his integrity, and his personality. His personal sacrifices of time and seemingly inexhaustible energy for the well-being of this Nation are widely

known, and Americans everywhere mourn the loss of one of its finest citizens.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I join my Republican colleagues today in expressing sorrow at the passing of Victor Johnston, field director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee. Few persons in public life were as knowledgeable as he was in the fields of government and politics. Yet, because he worked behind the scenes, serving officeholders and office-seekers in a dedicated but unassuming manner, Victor Johnston was little known, even to those who were followers of the American political scene.

He served a cross section of Republican Party leaders for over 20 years, and served them well. Both the men and women in politics, and the members of the press, valued him as a friend.

If it is in the best interest of American democracy to have a strong, responsible two-party system, and I believe it is, then Victor Johnston contributed greatly to this goal. My party will miss his dedication and his wise counsel. My personal sympathies go out to Mrs. Johnston, his family, and friends.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join with many of my colleagues in remembering Victor A. Johnston, a noble member of the Republican Party, and, in his own right, one of the powerful denizens of Capitol Hill. Vic was powerful because of his meaningful contacts with leaders in Washington, many of whom owed him homage for their successful elections. But Vic never chose to use this power. More than anything else, he is remembered for his unostentatious air and his preference for remaining behind the scenes.

It has been said that a man gets to heaven through the virtues of his wife, but a politician must say, if he is humble, that he achieved office through the virtues of his campaign manager. Mr. Johnston worked for and loyally supported all of the present Republican leaders in the Senate. And he gave Members of our party in the House of Representatives his constant advice and, whether we thought we needed it or not, his sympathy. Vic was a friendly port during political storms and a veritable lesson in American history.

Here was a man who could give a running account of the strengths and foibles of nationally acclaimed or defamed politicians. Vic Johnston came to Congress with Senator Joe McCarthy and he left service of Republican Senators during the leadership of the respected Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. He served the party for more than a quarter of a century, and never during that time was known to have said an unkind word about the people he tendered.

Mr. Johnston never personally worked in my campaigns, so my tribute to him is only as a friend, who was proud to know him. I learned much about the business of politics from Victor, not how to win an election, but the human side of this hectic business. His flowing white mane was a well-known sight here in Washington. He added a flavor that visi-

tors expect to see in the Nation's Capital.

And so I add my salute to Victor Johnston, a true gourmet of life.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Victor Johnston's service to the Republican Party and to American politics was long, dedicated, and constructive. During times of triumph and times of difficulty alike, he worked hard and patiently to promote the party's candidates and to advance its principles. Although he did not seek personal limelight, he was well known and well liked throughout the Nation, and his sudden death shocked and saddened us all.

I would like to add my voice to those paying deserved tributes to Vic Johnston today, and express my sincere condolences to his family, associates, and friends.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all those who knew Vic Johnston must be saddened by his loss. A fine gentleman, a loyal Republican, and a good friend to us all, Vic will be sorely missed by our party. I extend to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who arise here today to pay tribute to the late Victor A. Johnston. It was my good fortune to meet Vic Johnston in 1951 when I was just beginning my service in this body. Mr. Johnston at that time was an aid to my fellow Ohioan, the late Senator Robert A. Taft. Despite the great demands on his time, he gave me the benefit of his counseling, and that counseling was of great aid to me in the performance of my congressional duties. No man ever went to Victor Johnston for help and left unsatisfied.

Victor A. Johnston was a politician. It is true that he was a rarity amongst those who have chosen to serve in the political arena for he chose a life of anonymity—but because of his work, many men rose from that field of anonymity to great national recognition.

The Republican Party was indeed fortunate that it had such an astute, dedicated servant. The campaigns directed by him were wise and hard fought but always conducted with the integrity that was so ingrained in the man himself. Those with whom he contested went to him with outstretched hand when the campaign was over.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us mourn the passing of this great American. Those of us who had the privilege of his friendship were indeed fortunate. His passing has left an irreplaceable void in our lives.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the tribute to Victor A. Johnston, former staff director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of 1791 is a benchmark in the struggle of men to form governments guided by the consent of the governed.

When Poland adopted this constitution 176 years ago, the world was filled with assorted monarchies, tyrants, dictatorships. Total dominion over hundreds of thousands of people was the order of the day.

Under the provisions of this great constitution, however, protection was extended to the peasantry, the townsmen, and the people of Poland, regardless of their station. Law was finally on their side.

That such a document, modeled after our own great American Constitution, could be adopted in a continent seething with intrigue, power plays, and total disregard for human life and human integrity, is an indication of the intellectual depth and political courage of the Poles themselves.

By that modern and farsighted decision, Poland emerged from medieval times and stepped into the enlightened age of reason.

By this single stroke, Poland's Government was transformed from absolute monarchy to one of limited monarchy with guaranteed protection for all the people.

The obsolete, tyrannical features of the old system were abolished. Class distinctions were virtually eliminated. People were free to worship as their conscience guided them. The electorate was enlarged. Many of the economic barriers between the nobility and the merchants were removed.

As the world knows, Poland was invaded immediately after the enactment of the Constitution and suffered eventual extinction as an independent state.

So great was the historical imperative of that great Constitution, however, that May 3 has continued to be acclaimed as a day of celebration and joy and remembrance for Poles around the world.

The flame that flickered so bravely on that day 176 years ago lit fires of freedom in the hearts of honest men the world over. That such a document could be promulgated and so wholeheartedly accepted speaks eloquently of the quest for liberty that has endured through all the ages.

Men were not meant to live in bondage to other men. With the help of men of good will, the chains that even today bind millions of people to tyrannical oppressors will be broken. The people of the captive nations of Eastern Europe know that we in America will not forget their brave history and their fortitude in the face of overwhelming odds.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who at this late date still wonder what we are doing in Vietnam. Among these people are some who cannot understand that the great struggle for human dignity is going to inspire men, whether it was in 1791 in Poland or in 1967 in Vietnam.

This continues to be the mortar that holds men's dignity together. Still there are those of us and all of us who pray with all our hearts that we can bring to an early end the conflict in Vietnam. The fact of the matter remains that the very principles for which we are today fighting in Vietnam are the principles that men have fought for from the beginning of time.

We find in the Polish Constitution an example of the kind of bravery that can link men together to fight for an ideal and a cause. We find that same linking together today in Vietnam. So, as we pause to pay tribute to a document that was too revolutionary in 1791 for the continent of Europe and just as the people of Vietnam today are trying to carve out for themselves an island of human freedom and dignity, so these Poles 176 years ago tried to carve out for themselves a nation of dignity and freedom. Just as 176 years ago there were powers, dictators, men who could not understand the great force of freedom, who tried to extinguish the spirit of the Polish people, there are people today trying to extinguish that same spirit in the people of South Vietnam. We as Americans have paid tribute to these gallant Poles for these many years, and today we pay tribute to the great people of South Vietnam for the two instances are identical and parallel to each other.

Freedom has never been an easy commodity. Just as 176 years ago today the people of Poland dared to bring upon the continent of Europe a new concept of human dignity, so today millions of people are struggling for that same concept in Vietnam. We are certain that the day will come when tyranny will have to give way to freedom. This is why it is important for us to pause here in this Congress as we do once a year to pay tribute to the gallant Polish people. For their gallantry and stubborn belief in the dignity of man they have written their own page of inspiration. Similar pages have been written by other people in the past. We as Americans who are willing to pay the supreme price for our own human dignity and our own freedom always nurture and cherish those moments of history when people had the courage to stand up and fight for human dignity and freedom.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand with my colleagues in this Chamber today in commemoration of one of the great moments in history. Just as in 1791 the Polish people would not accept tyranny over the people of Poland, today I would hope, as I have said in previous years, that those who report the activities of Poland would make a distinction—Poland today continues to be Communist dominated, but Poland's people will never be Communists. One hundred seventy-six years ago they proclaimed the principle of human freedom and of human dignity and respect for the rights of the individual when they adopted the new Constitution that we honor here today. That principle and that spirit lives on in Poland today.

While the Communists impose on the people of Poland great restrictions in free speech and religious freedom and educational freedom, and on all of the

other freedoms, the fact remains that the spirit of freedom burns as brightly today among the 34 million Poles as it did in 1791 when they adopted this Constitution.

I know this: So long as we pause in this busy Congress as we do on various occasions, including the Polish Constitution Day, we will serve as a reminder to these people behind the Iron Curtain that this country has not forgotten their plight, and that we stand behind them in their fervent hopes and prayers that some day they will be able to join the family of free nations and free people, for indeed the good Lord intended man to be free.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of rich privilege that I join in tribute to the people of Poland and the giant contribution they have made to the welfare and the moral and cultural advancement of our country and of the world. I thank my good friend and able colleague from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for having set aside this time for observance here in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

During the many years that my constituents in the second district of Illinois, in their gracious generosity, have kept me in the Congress, never once have I been silent on Poland's proud anniversary. Chicago owes so very, very much to men and women of Polish birth or descent that silence on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 would be nothing less than a disservice to my constituents. The heart of the Polish people is part of the heart of the second district of Illinois.

Generals Kosciuszko and Pulaski fought beside Washington in our War for Independence. And long before that, in the earliest colonial days, the strength and courage and dedication of the Polish settlers supported John Smith in the perilous days at Jamestown in Virginia.

During our Civil War, Polish officers and troops fought for the preservation of the Union, while Polish nuns cared for the dying and the wounded on our battlefields.

In World Wars I and II, in Korea, and in Vietnam, American boys of Polish blood answered their country's call to make the world safe for democracy.

Lt. Julian Olejniczak, son of a steelworker from the 10th ward in Chicago, whose story of heroism was told in the Saturday Evening Post, is one of many heroes of the war in Vietnam whose forefathers came from Poland.

Ten of our colleagues from the Middle West in the House are of Polish blood: four from Chicago, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, the Honorable JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, and the Honorable DAN ROSENKOWSKI; two from Wisconsin, the Honorable ALVIN E. O'KONSKI and the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI; and two from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL and the Honorable LUCIAN NORBERT NEDZI.

I think it is not inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the distinguished gentleman to whom we are indebted for this special order [Mr. PUCINSKI], has a war record that is second to that of none. He was one of our first flyers over Japan when the risk was great and the danger ever present.

May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which marks that country as a pioneer of liberalism in Europe. It eliminated with one stroke the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 proclaimed:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Over a thousand years ago Poland linked her destiny with that of the West. During a period equal to one-half our Christian era, Poland linked her destiny with that of the West, and became an integral and creative force in its culture.

Today, Polish Americans have set their purpose to the ultimate liberation of their homeland. In their hopes and in the attainment of their prayers all Americans join.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON on Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman in the well upon the very fine statement which he has just made.

Mr. Speaker, all of us must remember that the Polish people are a people as a nation who have been good friends of the United States of America through many years. While the United States does not agree with policies of the present Government of Poland, nevertheless those of us who have been to Poland recently know of the real good will of the people toward America. It is good to send our U.S. greetings to the people of Poland.

We American friends of the Polish people know what good friends they are and how the Polish people have expressed their friendship over the years to the people of the United States. I join with my many U.S. friends of Polish descent in sending our friendship and best wishes on the occasion of Constitution Day.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our colleague from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] in this tribute to the Polish people.

In this day when much is said of change in Eastern Europe, we would do well to recall the most important feature of national sovereignty; that is, the right of a people to determine their own destiny.

What the Polish people yearn for today is not dissimilar to the ideals envisaged in the Polish Constitution of

May 3, 1791. Here was the kernel of constitutional democracy. Ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments were established; the liberum veto was abolished. The towns were given full administrative and judicial autonomy; special privileges of the gentry were abolished; serfs were placed under protection of the law, with a view to the complete elimination of serfdom.

The Constitution itself underscored the mainspring of the Polish state, the will of the people:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

There is little doubt, therefore, that the seed of democracy might have ripened if Poland had been given the chance. Unfortunately, this was not the case. In 1795, Poland was partitioned for the third time by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and disappeared as an independent state until after World War I.

Today, 176 years since the Constitution of May 3 was signed, we take the opportunity to commemorate the brave reforms of the Polish Constitution. As Americans who have experienced the war of independence, we extend our heartfelt support to the Polish people in their quest for freedom and liberty in their own land.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Congress once again pays tribute to a people who for more than a thousand years have endeavored to follow the path of peace and freedom, the people of Poland.

We are all acquainted with their struggles over the centuries, and that a Communist regime is utilizing all its power to force them to forget the democratic glory of the May 3 Constitution of 1791. This they will never do. It has become a cherished tradition that has sustained them in spite of the heavy yoke of Communist rule. It is not merely a document in history's archives, but a vital symbol of assurance that Poland will once again stand in full freedom and liberty. The Communists have suppressed freedom of expression in many areas, but they will never extinguish it in Poland.

Toward the end of World War I, the people of Poland proclaimed their independence once more, and for the next 20 years the history of Poland was one of reconstruction and revival. They took their place among the sovereign, independent states of Europe, and became a power in Eastern European affairs. However, in 1939 Poland was marked for destruction by the joining of the two forces of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. During World War II the fate of these brave people was most uncertain and, unfortunately, their sufferings did not end with the conclusion of that conflict. They have been under a Communist regime since 1945 that has been as oppressive as any of their former foreign foes.

For more than 20 years they have suffered under totalitarian tyranny, and while there is a continued effort by the Communists to throttle communication between the citizens of Poland and the

West, the bonds of friendship cannot be wiped out.

We, in America, owe much to our fellow Americans of Polish extraction who have enriched our culture and defended our Nation in its time of need, and on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, we join with them in the ardent hope and prayer that Poland will soon again be truly free and independent.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we take time today to observe one of the most important events in the annals of democratic government. On May 3, 1791, the people of Poland proclaimed a new constitution that included the rights of free speech, free press, and the guarantees of democratic institutions we have in our own heritage.

This remarkable document of a nation with whom many associate, at least geographically and historically, non-Western traditions actually reaffirmed Poland's position as one of the fore-runners of what we call the Western Community of Nations. Some 800 years before, when Poland embarked on the first millenium, the British nation with whom is identified democratic society and parliamentary government had barely begun its modern history. It was 100 years before William the Conqueror and his Normans moved into the British Isles.

Although Poland's experience with liberalism based on the fundamentals of human freedom and national sovereignty was shortlived as a result of its partitioning, its heritage has served well the Western World. Moreover, the seed of liberal democracy that was planted in 1791 has sustained the Polish people, withstanding both the test of time and the periodic onslaught of alien domination.

The tenacity of Polish nationalism is evidenced by the fact that from time to time since the partitioning in 1795, the Polish will has been heard and felt despite the suppressive measures that have been brought to bear.

It is inevitable that Poland's identity will be renewed again. Its strength and power will not be denied; for Poland's history is filled with the presence of patriots, authors and scientists, individuals with inquiring minds ready to challenge old myths because their respect for truth and quest of knowledge could not be stifled.

During this commemoration of Poland's National Liberation Day, we should draw attention, also, to anniversaries in the lives of several individuals of that character. This year marks the 150th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, to whom our Nation owes so much for his help during our own struggle for independence. We observe, too, the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the renowned author who gave us the moving novel, "Quo Vadis." And this is the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium, who uncovered and discovered the fundamental properties of the atom.

It is readily understandable, Mr. Speaker, why we join the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry to com-

memorate this day, the threshold of the second millenium. Not only are we eternally grateful for the lasting contributions of the three distinguished individuals I have mentioned, but we are forever indebted to the Polish nation as a whole for its legacy of liberal democracy.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to address the House today in commemoration of the Polish national holiday. I call to the attention of my colleagues the significance of this historic moment in Poland's history, when on May 3, 1791, they adopted a Constitution where—

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It was an assertion of democracy by the Polish people of that era, who recognized the need for individual freedoms so that man may fulfill his desires by his own initiative and choice rather than by dictation and force. This great rebirth by the Poles followed by 2 years the action of the people of the United States, who adopted a constitution whereby the government would be of the people, by the people, and for the people. We, in this Nation today, enjoy the privileges of this declaration and we have grown in strength and stature as the result of this action. However, in Poland today, the people are not that fortunate, for they are again in the throes of forceful direction by a power which rules their destiny not by their own choice but by tyranny. But whatever the Government of Poland may be, the spirit of liberal democracy and independence remains strong in the hearts of the Poles. It is their will to return to the principles of their Constitution and fulfill its objectives.

Because Poland took the initiative in 1791 to gain their independence, they have been a symbol for democracy in Eastern Europe. However, they have never had an opportunity to move forward as a free nation, because the forces of anarchy, which have dominated Eastern Europe, will not permit them to gain a stronghold as a free nation. Just 2 years after they declared their independence the Imperial Russian forces overran their country placing them in bondage. It was not until World War I that Poland was able to again claim its right as a free nation. Their independence was short lived for in 1939 the forces of nazism attacked them and with overwhelming might again placed them under bondage. With the Allied victory in World War II the Polish people were hopeful that they would regain their Government, however, the forces of communism which occupied their territory refused to give them this privilege and today they are under the rule of the Soviet Union. However, the people of Poland have not lost faith in their desire for freedom. With each passing day the people become more determined to win their cause.

But their struggle is not isolated for this same struggle is taking place in

other parts of the world. Unless we, as the leader of the free nations, continue to support the strong cause of freedom, liberty will not triumph. If we can continue to encourage the oppressed people, they will seek their place and gain their individual independence.

A change toward a system of individualism is being forced on the Communist regime, and in time, the people will again rule themselves. I know we all look and hope for that day.

So let us speak out in observance of Polish Constitution Day and show the world that we intend to make every effort to see that tyranny and atheism are wiped out. Let us not discourage but encourage the peoples of the world to join us in the enjoyment of independence. By encouraging those under Communist rule to work for democracy we can one day enjoy a democratic society in a free world.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, which is thus barely 2 years younger than our own great document. The similarities do not stop there, however, for the same spirit and belief in freedom which inspire the American Revolution and the U.S. Constitution were equally felt by the Polish people. This is well seen in the following quotation from the Polish Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of Society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

This democratic philosophy was considered a threat to Poland's totalitarian neighbors from its first pronouncement to the present day. Foreign armies, taking advantage of the lack of natural protective boundaries, have repeatedly violated Polish soil, but have been unable to quench the spirit of Polish liberty. We may anticipate with confidence that the day is not far off when Poland will again be free of all foreign domination and the Polish people will be able to determine their own destinies.

It is appropriate on this very important anniversary that we take note of three other significant events in Polish history. This year marks the 50th year since the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the great Polish novelist and winner of the Nobel Prize in literature, whose famous trilogy dealt with Poland's 17th century struggle for national independence.

The year 1967 is also the centennial of the birth of Marie Skłodowska-Curie, the noted scientist and Nobel Prize winner in physics, as well as the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the Polish hero of independence.

In observing these important events, we should not only do honor to the memory of the departed great, but we should also recognize the invaluable contributions made to our Nation by the 10 million Americans of Polish origin. They have infused the traditional Polish love of democracy, and the invaluable gift of the Polish genius for creativity into the American culture. On this anniversary I extend greetings to all Americans of Polish descent and assure them of the

moral support of the American people in their efforts to attain the liberation of Poland from Communist domination.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 176th anniversary of Poland's Constitution. On May 3, in 1791, Poland adopted a liberal Constitution, similar in many respects to our own American Constitution. But, unlike ours, it was never tested by time. The ink was barely dry when Poland was overrun and partitioned by her neighbors—Russia, Austria, and Prussia.

It is to Poland's lasting credit that she lit the torch of freedom and human rights those many years ago. She had a Senate and a House of Representatives as early as the 14th century, and she had local assemblies where representatives were chosen.

Poland extended freedom and religious tolerance to all within her boundaries. Her representative government was founded on the principle that the right to govern rested primarily with the people, and that the people were entitled to a voice in government.

While the Polish Constitution was written nearly two centuries ago, it is apparent that the love of freedom expressed in that document still lives and thrives in the heart of the Polish people. Americans who have traveled in Poland recently tell me that the love of liberty and independence has not been stifled by the brutality of Poland's oppressors these many years.

Our ties with Poland are broad and deep, and they go as far back as Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski, both of whom were great freedom fighters in our country as well as in their native land. America is indebted to Poland for giving us these military leaders at a time of need. America is just as greatly indebted to Poland for the sons and daughters she has given us who have contributed so much to the development of our Nation's culture, industrial might, and the professions—from the hardest and most menial kind of labor to the highest levels of achievement. Over 7 million Polish-Americans are an integral part of the American mainstream.

As we salute the brave and gallant Polish people on this anniversary today, we hope and pray that the day will come soon when Poland will be liberated and again take her rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House of Representatives to commemorate a day which is dear not only to persons of Polish extraction but to all people throughout the world who love freedom.

Today, May 3, 1967, marks the anniversary of the adoption of the great Polish Constitution of 1791. Unfortunately, the love of liberty which can never be crushed in the Polish soul has not been allowed to be made manifest in that unhappy nation because today Poland suffers under the yoke of Soviet imperialism. This has been the tragic situation almost consistently since 1795. Today, as then, the ancient and proud people of Poland are suffering under a campaign of forced Russification. Yet, there is something in the Polish national character which can never be crushed

and despite the tyranny and foreign oppression which has been Poland's unhappy lot, the nationalistic spirit and the Christian faith of the Polish people remain strong and resolute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote to this House just one paragraph from the Constitution of 1791:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal and on a lasting foundation.

While the Constitution of 1791 was not a lasting document because of foreign oppression, its words ring down through the years and its meaning is as clear today as it was almost two centuries ago.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, when we glance at this great document, that Americans of Polish extraction are model citizens and exemplifiers of the splendid American dream. Hard work and honesty have been the distinctively Polish contribution to this United States and in my own 14th Congressional District, it is well known that neighbors of Polish extraction are universally good neighbors and on this great day all of the people of the 14th District, and I have the honor to represent a wide variety of ethnic and ethnoreligious groups, join together to say a silent prayer that once again the people of Poland will know the blessings of liberty and will have a chance to be the masters of their own destiny.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland, by action of its Parliament on May 3, 1791, adopted what historians believe to be the first constitution embodying the basic tenets of human dignity and liberty, and established the basis for real democracy and democratic development of that nation. Laboring under the tremendous strain and stress of surrounding dictatorships, with Russia, Prussia, and Austria carving out or attempting to appropriate huge areas within its rightful boundaries, the Polish leaders of that day stood firm in their resolve to give to the people of Poland a form of government founded on the same democratic principles which later became the foundation stone of our great Government. Those were dark days for the liberty-loving Polish people, with dictators on all sides threatening to obliterate all Polish culture—yes, even the Polish language—and replacing them with the cultures and languages of these autocratic neighbors. But the National Diet stood firm in proclaiming the new Constitution, thus giving to the world this new concept of orderly, humane government.

Unfortunately, the adoption of this new form of government did not end the trials and tribulations of this great land and its people. The sinister influences of greed and aggression which has characterized her neighbors throughout the centuries and her inability because of her geographical and physical makeup to ward off the constant encroachment and attacks by her neighbors, brought about the further partitioning in 1836. Notwithstanding the continuing burdens of foreign oppression, the stalwart Poles never gave up their quest for freedom and independence.

There has remained within the heart and minds of Poles throughout the years the undying belief and determination that their culture, their patriotism, their democratic principles would ultimately triumph and that they would be permitted to live within their rightful borders in peace and tranquility. That hope and that belief is still fervently alive in the present population of Poland, crushed as it has been by present-day Communist dictatorship.

During the oppressive years of the 19th century many of the cultural and political leaders were forced to flee their homeland taking refuge in France, in England and in our own land of the free. Chopin fled to France, and there gave to the world his immortal works. Earlier Kosciuszko and Pulaski, fired with the spirit of independence and liberty, came to our shores to contribute immeasurably to our successful struggle for freedom.

After many years of foreign rule and domination, Poland again became a free nation as a result of our intercession following World War I. Its leaders were then faced with the struggle of establishing democracy after the tortuous years of autocratic rule. Great progress was being made, at times against almost insurmountable obstacles, but again, before their dreams had been fulfilled the iron heel of conquerors and oppressors took over their fair land in 1939, and the all too recurrent struggle for freedom and liberty has been renewed. To the eternal credit of the Polish people everywhere, the light of liberty remains undimmed. It is being carried and preserved by the faithful and determined Poles throughout the world. The struggle for freedom will not end until Poland has once more been returned to the circle of free nations, its people assured of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They rightfully look to our Nation for this relief; they know that the triumph of liberty and justice throughout the world for which we are expending our all will be shared by her brave people.

On this 176th anniversary date of their adoption of the first constitution of democracy I want to urge the Polish people to continue their faith in the ultimate triumph or right over might. The day is not far distant when they will again breathe the air of freedom, when their nightmares will have been forgotten and the joys of liberty and constitutional democracy will return to their beloved land.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place into the RECORD a letter from the Polish American Congress on the subject of the observation of Polish Constitution Day and the several observances which occur in 1967 which are of great interest to the Poles throughout the world.

The letter follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1967.

Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: Commemorative programs in Congress marking Poland's May 3rd Constitution of 1791 and other significant

events in one thousand years of the history of the Polish nation, have become a proud and cherished part of the ethnic heritage of ten million Americans of Polish ancestry. They are gratefully aware of the fact that these commemorative programs in Congress form a continuation of the golden thread of friendship, understanding and mutual pursuit of the ideals of freedom and independence that is woven into the fabric of the history of the American and Polish nations.

On the threshold of the second millennium as a nation born of its baptism and reared in Christian precepts of the West, Poland today needs our encouragement and help. Suffering under communist tyranny as the result of diplomatic confusion among the allied powers, the Polish nation, once called by a former President of the United States "an inspiration of mankind" for its heroic deeds in World War II, today fights with courage and rectitude to save its millennial heritage of Western culture from the encroachment by atheistic communism and its tyrannical disregard for human rights and the dignity of man.

May 3rd is the silent national holiday of the Poles longing for freedom and independence in Poland. Silent—because the communist regime is utilizing all its powers to force the nation to forget the democratic glory of the May 3rd Constitution.

This year's observance draws our attention to other significant anniversaries in Polish history. Namely: the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz and the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie.

The Polish American Congress which represents approximately ten million Americans of Polish origin, sincerely appreciates your past participation in the May 3rd programs in Congress, and appeals for your assistance in making the coming observance as impressive and memorable as in previous years.

With highest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish
American Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced legislation this afternoon which would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp honoring Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium, which permitted us to enter the atomic age, on the centennial of her birth which occurs on November 7, 1967.

Without Mme. Sklodowska-Curie's discovery we could not perform the scientific experiments and enter into the atomic age—an age that we could exploit in terms of the peaceful use of atomic energy for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 1791, drafted and adopted on May 3 of that year is marked as a revolutionary move without bloodshed. By its liberal, democratic and progressive provisions Poland's governmental machinery was immensely improved and made more efficient. It placed a real check on the absolutism of the king. Irresponsible council type of government was cast aside and ministerial responsibility was introduced in its place. The king still retained many of his prerogatives, but these were to be exercised through a council. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old system were abolished, and class distinctions were wiped out. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made

available to all townsmen, and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. All these progressive features represented definite advances over anything yet known in that part of Europe.

It is almost tragic that Polish people could not enjoy the benefit of their Constitution of 1791, for they lost their freedom a few years after its proclamation. In observing the anniversary of that Constitution we in the free world echo the genuine patriotic sentiments of the Polish people.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate today in the commemoration of the 176th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, over 30,000 of whom live in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, will pause to observe this significant anniversary.

It gives me great pleasure to join them, and my distinguished Colleagues of Polish extraction in the Congress, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan; Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York; Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, of Illinois; Hon. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, of Michigan; Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois; Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois; and Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, in celebrating Polish Constitution Day. My colleagues have afforded able and patriotic leadership, not only to Polish-Americans, but to all the American people. I commend and compliment the gentlemen for their dedicated public service and for their continuing efforts to sustain the hope for a Poland free from Communist bondage.

The adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791 was a milestone in the history of Poland for it established a limited monarchy supported by a Parliament; privileges of land ownership and holding of public office were given to the townsmen; the peasants were placed under protection of the law; the first steps toward complete abolition of serfdom were taken; class distinctions were done away with; and absolute religious toleration was established.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 was thus a milestone in the struggle of mankind to establish representative and democratic governments with the full protection of law and equal justice extended to all of the people.

That these judicial and political reforms were instituted at all is an accomplishment worthy of note, but that they were accomplished without bloodshed or domestic violence is indeed awe inspiring. On May 3, 1791, Poland demonstrated to the world what could be done when a nation dedicates itself to the ideals of democracy and liberty for all its people.

May 3 has thus rightfully become a national Polish holiday. While the Poles did not have the privilege to live for long under this Constitution, the true spirit of the Constitution lives on in their hearts, and one day soon the dream of

freedom for which they have struggled over the turbulent centuries will be realized.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, this House has set aside time, as it does every year on May 3, to commemorate the Constitution proclaimed by Poland in 1791.

As Americans who cherish the freedoms guaranteed by a Constitution born in the same era, we should be particularly mindful of the problems of the Polish people—a proud people, whose history as a nation has survived tragedy in every century since its founding in the year 966.

America's geographic isolation has long been one of our Nation's strengths. Poland, on the other hand, has been the victim of geography—a battlefield on which the rising and descending powers of Europe and Asia tested their strength at the expense of the Polish people. And yet, despite the long years of subjugation, the strong will for freedom has never weakened, their quest for independence has never faltered.

Neither the Mongol hordes, nor the Swedes, nor the Hapsburgs, nor the Russians, nor the Nazis were able to extinguish the burning desire of the Polish people or the democratic spirit of the Polish Constitution. Nor will the present ruler succeed. Even in the world of monolithic communism, Poland is the strongest renegade—the Polish tradition, strongly steeped in freedom and religion—defies full domination by a foreign power.

The Polish link to American independence is a testament to this yearning for political rights and liberty. It was established early in our history when the first group of Polish settlers came to the New World in 1608 to help settle Jamestown and were praised for their industry by Capt. John Smith. Many sons of Poland fought in General Washington's Army during the American Revolution. The best known among them were Kosciuszko and Pulaski.

Today Americans of Polish descent fight side by side with Americans whose ancestors came from nations around the world. They fight for our freedom, so it is fitting that we in America remember Poland by marking the 167th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, and we pay tribute to a people whose free spirit will one day throw off the yoke of tyranny to give an indomitable nation its rightful place among other nations.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to preserve the democratic glory of the May 3 Constitution of Poland, I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement that I have received from the Polish American Congress pertaining to the May 3 Polish national holiday.

This statement eloquently manifests the greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution and serves to remind us that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

We are deeply indebted to the Poles and should never forget their great contribution toward the betterment of mankind.

Though the Polish nation now lies within the confines of communism, I am certain that a strong national spirit still

prevails and that one day soon this great nation will once again enjoy its freedom to pursue the democratic way of life.

The statement follows:

MAY 3D—THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY
(By the Polish American Congress, Inc.,
Washington, D.C.)

On May 3rd Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises through the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3rd in 1791, barely two years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the Third of May Polish constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, few events in the glorious history of man's struggle for democratic ideals are more significant than the promulgation of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. Today, 176 years later, the world remembers and hails that momentous victory for democracy.

Throughout this month, Americans in cities, towns, and villages from coast to coast will pay tribute to the Polish nation as a pioneer in the spirit of liberalism. In an age largely characterized by autocracy, the courageous Polish patriots set forth a document embodying great liberal, progressive, and democratic ideals. Their constitution laid the foundation for a form of government, which, if adhered to faithfully, could have brought a large measure of genuine democracy to the people of Poland. It provided for ministerial representation, eliminated invidious class distinctions, paved the way for the eventual abolition of serfdom, established full religious toleration, and made way for further governmental reforms. In some ways it is strikingly similar to our own American Constitution, set forth 2 years earlier; for example, in the words of the Polish Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is a great tragedy of Polish history that the great Third of May Constitution was never allowed to be realized. Its promise was destined to go unfulfilled, for Poland was forced to endure the terrible Second Partition in 1793. Yet exterior forces could never really mar the significance of Poland's great stride toward democracy taken on that great day in May, for Poland had proclaimed irrevocably and for all time that her people were on the side of liberty and democracy.

Today, then, Mr. Speaker, we join in paying tribute to a great people and a great nation. I send greetings to my many friends of Polish ancestry in my own Third District of Pennsylvania, as well as throughout the United States and the world. By commemorating this glad occasion we pledge ourselves once again to the glorious ideal that one day all men shall be free.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Polish nation, although partitioned and suppressed many times throughout its history, has not fallen into oblivion or obscurity. Rather, it has amazed the family of nations with its capability to muster strength and courage, to rebuild its fallen walls, and to produce men whose stature and significance are respected by all.

A chronicle of the sciences, for example, would not be complete without mention of Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie. Together with her husband, Pierre, Mme. Curie defined the fundamental properties of the atom and discovered radium. For outstanding achievements in physics, the Curies received the Nobel Prize in 1903 and 9 years later, in 1912, Mme. Sklodowska-Curie was awarded the Nobel Prize again, this time for her preparation of pure uranium and for defining

its atomic weight. On this 100th anniversary of her birth, we laud the famous Polish scientist and her contribution to the field of physics.

Literature, too, bears the mark of Polish endeavors, and today, we would do well to single out Henryk Sienkiewicz for distinction. Truly great literary works withstand both the test of time and the limitations of nationality. Last fall recorded the 50th anniversary of the death of Mr. Sienkiewicz but there can be no doubt that "Quo Vadis," the masterpiece of this Polish author, has been established as a permanent and universal contribution to world literature.

Perhaps the most noteworthy efforts of the Poles lie in the political realm, for these constitute the backbone of a state. This year we commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, well known as a freedom fighter, both to the Polish and the American scene. Kosciuszko had served in the Continental Army for about 6 years during the Revolutionary War. He knew and understood the struggle for a nation's independence; he hoped the same could be achieved for Poland. In 1784, when news of impending internal reforms in Poland reached Kosciuszko, he hastened home to offer support and encouragement.

On May 3, 1791, Polish patriots instigated a written revolution in the form of a Constitution. The reforms provided for in the Constitution were far reaching in their initiation of democratic principles. The paralyzing liberum veto was abolished, while ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments were instituted, both of which showed promise of being effective instruments of government. Furthermore, suffrage was extended, and the peasants were placed under protection of the law.

Unhappily, neither the ardor of the reformers nor the armed battle of men like Kosciuszko sufficed to withstand stronger foreign powers. Poland was partitioned at the beginning of 1793 by Russia and Prussia, and then again in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

Though the brave attempts of the Constitution of May 3 were suppressed, the ideals have been revived and passed on through generations of Poles. Just as Poland continues to produce men and women of outstanding abilities, so it will perpetuate the struggle for liberty. The Polish spirit cannot be vanquished: determined in character, courageous of heart, it will yet see the dreams of Kosciuszko realized; it will inspire more Sklodowska-Curies and Sienkiewiczs; it will resuscitate the democratic principles of the Constitution of May 3.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution of Poland. That great Polish document was an outstanding landmark in the rich history of that nation, and, indeed, in the history of mankind's striving for democracy.

Set forth in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own American Constitution, the May 3 Constitution contained an undeniable promise of democracy for Poland. Contemporary observ-

ers hailed it for its progressive, liberal, and democratic spirit. The great British statesman and political theorist, Edmund Burke, exclaimed that it "contained the seeds of continuous improvement, being built on the same principles which make our British constitution so excellent."

Let us look briefly at some of the outstanding features of that great document. The May 3 Constitution converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Ministerial responsibility was an extremely important part of the constitution, for herein lay the seeds of a British type of constitutionalism. Moreover, the Constitution abolished the obstructive machinery of the antiquated system of government and eliminated class distinctions. Peasants were placed under the protection of the law. Absolute religious tolerance was established. Yet, regrettably, this glorious blueprint for Polish democracy was destined to be discarded only 2 years later as a "dangerous novelty," in the terrible Second Partition of Poland in 1793.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the May 3 Constitution was set aside on September 23, 1793, when Poland was reduced to one-third of her original size, having lost all her eastern provinces to Russia and much of her territory on the west to Prussia. Yet, long after the destruction and evil of those conquering powers have been forgotten, mankind will preserve the memory of the great May 3 Constitution. In commemorating this great occasion of May 3, we help preserve the sacred memory of one of man's most significant acts.

Mr. Speaker, commemoration of the great Polish anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole, of every American of Polish origin, and, yes, of every man everywhere who believes in democracy. It is thus a very meaningful and heart-warming occasion, not only in my own fifth district of Illinois, but throughout our great land, and all over the free world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on this 176th anniversary of Poland's pioneering Constitution of 1791, I want to join with many of my colleagues in remembrance of Poland's great contributions in the struggle to advance human freedom and the level of attainment by civilized man. And I am honored to renew my pledge to do all I can to help bring about the achievement once again of true Polish freedom and independence.

No nation on the face of this earth has been more dedicated than Poland, throughout its long and frequently tragic history, in the cause of human freedom and national independence. And no nation has been a greater beneficiary of that dedication than these United States, where we owe so much in our own Revolutionary War to the gallant Polish heroes who adopted our cause as their own.

No nation, Mr. Speaker, has done more to advance the cultural level of our civilization. And no nation has contributed a harder and more loyal stream of immigrants to our shores. It is significant

that the Constitution of 1791 which we honor today was, like our own Constitution of 1787, a source of inspiration to those who cherish freedom throughout the world.

During the past year, in which the millennial anniversary of Christianity in Poland was celebrated, many hopes for the full reintegration of the Polish people into the free community of nations were aroused. The spiritual achievements of this anniversary celebration will have lasting influence. By comparison the implacable hostility of the Polish Government to freedom of worship, made manifest in mean and jealous restrictions, will someday pass and be forgotten.

Yet with all President Johnson's commendable efforts to improve our relations with Poland, it must be observed that the Communist government's attitude still apparently remains unchanged. Only last month President Ochab, of Poland made a 3-day state visit to Rome. Although such calls are a tradition for visiting heads of state, the Polish President omitted any call upon Pope Paul VI. The New York Times reported the belief of Vatican experts that the last chief of state to shun a meeting with the pontiff was Adolf Hitler, during his visit to Mussolini in May 1938. It is a parallel that should give the Polish Government pause.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate to call attention to a very practical, concrete step which the House of Representatives can take to advance the cause of individual and national freedom in Poland as well as other captive nations. A special committee of this chamber could conduct an inquiry and study of all the captive nations including those in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia and elsewhere. Particular reference should be made to the moral and legal status of Communist totalitarian control over these nations, and to the conditions existing there. Emphasis should also be placed on the means by which our own country can best assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their freedoms.

In this 90th Congress and in the three preceding ones, I have sponsored, along with other Members, a resolution to achieve these purposes. House Resolution 14, to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, which I introduced, is now before the House Rules Committee, along with resolutions for the same purpose sponsored by a dozen of my colleagues. Our resolution would establish a committee of 10 Members of the House from both parties, appointed by the Speaker. It would make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deemed proper. It would file its first comprehensive report, together with its recommendations, by January 31, 1968.

I feel confident that the facts brought to light through these studies and hearings would themselves focus a powerful searchlight on an empire too shrouded by darkness. They would lend strength and encouragement to those who may feel they are struggling alone to advance the cause of man's dignity and freedom,

in Poland and elsewhere among the captive nations.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we mark this anniversary of Polish freedom under law, I hope each of us will resolve to do all we can to speed the day when Poland will once again be a wholly independent member of the international community of nations. And I believe we can speed the day when the friends of liberty in Poland can feel that their individual freedom and dignity have at last become secure.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, and in doing so, we celebrate and honor the deep ties between our country and the people of Poland.

These ties are rooted in the principles we share, principles which were strikingly enunciated by the Constitution of May 3, 1791: liberty, representation, protection under law. They originated in the valiant participation of Polish soldiers and patriots in our own revolution and have been nourished by the rich gifts the Polish people have brought to our life and culture.

We all know how greatly Poland has suffered since it fell to invading Russian Armies shortly after 1791. Repeatedly, it has borne oppression, partition, denial of religious and political freedom. But its people have never been without hope for the restoration of their freedom, never without faith in the ultimate triumph of their hope.

In my judgment, the finest tribute we can offer them on this anniversary is to rededicate ourselves to the achievement for all men of the ideals they espoused so nobly, so tragically briefly in the Constitution of 1791.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the occasion of one of the most important Polish national holidays: the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It was on this date 176 years ago that Poland adopted the Constitution through which the country transformed itself into a modern state. The Constitution was adopted at a critical time in Polish history. In 1772, the absolute rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory. Facing possible annihilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new Constitution which was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

Regrettably, the Polish people have not been as fortunate as these other peoples, for the aggressive policies of bordering countries have time and again violated the sovereign territory of Poland. It is ironic, today, that this historic Polish date is not even mentioned in Poland under the present Communist dictatorship, but is observed by the many Polish communities in the free world, especially in the United States.

The support of both American and Polish citizens for the same principle of freedom can be described in similar historic events. It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of a constitution by the United States, that Poland without a bloody revolution or any disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline.

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution lies in the principle it embraced: the sovereignty of the people in the state. We Americans often take this principle for granted, for we have been reared in it as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic. The Polish people, however, were pioneers in a Europe beset with dictatorships and the principle of absolute state sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism system of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

The natural geographic protection of oceans and friendly neighbors has allowed the United States to nurture the growth of its system of government based upon a belief in the sovereignty of the people. The Polish people have not been offered the same opportunity. But this reality does not negate the importance of this occasion. The May 3 Polish Constitution was based upon a principle that citizens of Polish ancestry living anywhere in the free world can proudly support and join in celebrating. The principle is one men of all nationalities can actively support.

To the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry and to the many other citizens of the free world who are descendants of that land, we can pay no greater tribute, we can make no greater wish, than to urge their continuing support for the principle so clearly stated in their May 3 Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day. In the United States, alone, reside 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry.

It is highly significant that the "free Poles" have chosen as their day of national celebration the anniversary of the Constitution of Poland of May 3, 1791. It is not the day celebrated by the Communist government which today dominates Poland. For the Constitution of 1791—a truly remarkable document—epitomized the soul of a free Poland, the spirit of a people who, remembering a glorious past, were emerging from domination, and were confident of a future of freedom.

Long had Poland been the victim of her stronger neighbors, Russia and Prussia, both of whom used her as a buffer to their own military might, as well as a sphere of compensation for gains by the other on battlefields elsewhere. When Frederick the Great of Prussia died in 1786, relationships between Russia and Prussia deteriorated. Russia became involved in a war with Turkey. This involvement drew their attention from the Polish "problem," giving the leaders of that country sufficient security to embark

on a reform of the Constitution, to bring it into line with the liberal thinking then current in Western Europe as manifested in the American Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and the stirrings of the French Revolution. A meeting of the Polish Parliament was called in 1788 to set about drafting these constitutional reforms, and the patriotic liberals, with the encouragement of King Stanislas, were hopeful that their propositions would be given immediate and careful consideration.

As often happens when the forces of change meet the forces of reaction, progress was considerably slowed—the discussions dragged on with opposition to liberalism and moderation being led by the military and landowning aristocracy. Nevertheless, with patience and awareness of every opportunity offered for progress on May 4, 1791—3 years since the original draft had been presented—the proposed constitution was placed before the Parliament for ratification and became the law of the land.

That Constitution paid tribute to a noble past. It was designed for a then free Poland. Yet it looked to the distant future as well as to the contemporary scene—the theme of that Constitution was the love of liberty, the respect for individual freedom, and the granting of the rights of the individual on the basis of equality. This Constitution was, moreover, to be the standard for all the laws and statutes of all future legislatures of Poland. Provision was made for religious freedom, for the civil liberties, for personal liberty, and the guarantee of these liberties by common defense.

In remembering their manifesto to those liberties as framed in the constitutional reforms of 1791, let us salute all those who sacrificed so much for what all of us hold so dear.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 18th century is best remembered for giving birth to democratic ideas and institutions. In that age of revolutionary fervor the Poles wanted a new governmental machinery, more efficient and progressive than the one they had. In 1791 their democratic leaders prepared a constitution that was to meet their needs.

That historic constitution placed a real check on the absolutism of the king. A constitutional form of government was established, one with a cabinet of ministerial responsibility. The powers of the upper legislative chamber were curtailed, and those of the lower chamber were considerably enhanced. The electorate was enlarged and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Many class distinctions and privileges were abolished and the arbitrary power of local landlords over the peasantry was eliminated. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and the provision was made for the periodic amendment of the Constitution. With all these sweeping changes the Polish Constitution of May 1791 was rightly regarded as a momentous document; as such it was hailed by the champions of freedom everywhere. The Poles have always looked back at this constitution as their charter for freedom, and have observed its anniversary with due solemnity. On the observance of the 176th anniversary of Polish Con-

stitution Day I am delighted to join my Polish-American friends.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to commemorate the 176th anniversary of the proclamation of a Polish Constitution. On May 3, 1791, a short 2 years after our fledgling Nation promulgated its Constitution, Poland issued the first national declaration of liberalism Europe was to witness.

Their Constitution gave voice to the same aspirations for freedom and individual rights, breathed life into the same national longing for liberty that inspired our early patriots.

But unlike us, the people of Poland were not long able to enjoy the fruits of an enlightened Constitution. She fell victim to one, then another, of her mightier neighbors' ambitions for conquest and territorial gain.

Even now she bears the heel of an oppressive dictatorship; and the Communist ideology of an absentee landlord seeks to smother the atmosphere of freedom bravely born on that May day in 1791.

On this day we commemorate, as well, the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, that great Polish patriot, who fought for the cause of freedom in these United States when we sought our independence. Let us note, too, the 100th anniversary of the birth of Madam Curie, born Marie Sklodowska in Warsaw, Poland, in 1867. Her contributions to the world of medicine secure her a lasting place in history and are a particular source of pride to her native countrymen.

That this kindred nation, which has given so many of her sons and daughters to enrich our country and strengthen the bonds between us, is not yet free, stands as a challenge to all free men. Let today's commemoration be not only a tribute, but a solemn pledge to help Poland rejoin the brotherhood of independent nations.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that in the celebration of Poland's Constitution Day in the United States we hark back to the Polish Constitution of 1791. That document, forged only 4 years after our own Constitution and in the era of our Bill of Rights, like the latter, places strong emphasis upon the rights of the individual. In this respect the Polish Constitution reflects strongly the spirit of the times, which reached a climax a few years later in the French Revolution.

The theme of the Polish Constitution of 1791 is the love of liberty, the respect for individual freedom, the granting of equality to all its people. The courage and determination to achieve these goals for country and for the individuals who constitute it seem to emanate from this document. The note of freedom is recurrent as provision is made for the scheme of government. In it is expressed the determination to guard "liberty, and our natural rights" with "zeal and firmness," prizing this liberty and these rights "more than life, and every personal consideration" not only contemporaneously but for "future generations."

These clauses strike a note of sympathy in the United States. How like our

own ideals and expressed principles, they make us reflect, too, upon our greater good fortune. For us throughout the ensuing century and a half there has been preserved for us a government which has respected that spirit of individual liberty and been able to maintain its independence as a country. Poland has been less fortunate. During that time its independence has been trampled, annihilated, restored, only to be trampled again. But the independent spirit of the Polish people has never been extinguished. In recent years it has found renewed expression to a certain extent, and there is further hope for the future.

Our sympathy extends beyond the formal barriers to Poland's freedom. We recognize the indomitable soul of Poland which through the ages has triumphed and maintained its faith in individual liberty and the dignity of man.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleagues in our observing this 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, a truly great and historic document adopted on May 3, 1791.

The harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere. It is, therefore, fitting that we clearly manifest to the brave Polish people the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their just aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

President Woodrow Wilson, in his January 1918 message to Congress, included in his famous 14 points the declaration that an independent Polish state should be erected. Ignace Paderewski organized thousands of Poles in America as volunteers to fight in support of that cause.

Poland, suffering under Communist tyranny today, still fights with courage and rectitude to save its ancient heritage of Western culture from the encroachment by atheistic communism and its ruthless disregard for human rights and the dignity of man.

Through coincidence, this year's observance also is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko who rendered great service to the American Revolution. He was a military aide to George Washington and President Thomas Jefferson paid eloquent tribute to him as "the purest spirit of liberty."

This year also marks the centennial of the birth of a world renowned scientist who was born in Poland; namely, Madam Curie. Maris Sklodowska Curie discovered and defined the fundamental properties of the atom from radioactivity that changed the course of scientific thought. The entire world owes this citizen of Poland everlasting gratitude for her great contribution to science.

The year 1967 is also the 50th anniversary of the passing of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the greatest novelist Poland produced. Through his great novel of universal appeal "Quo Vadis," Sienkiewicz personified Poland's contribution to the growth and development of Western culture. Politically, Sienkiewicz was an "am-

bassador of Poland." It was he, who pleaded before the bar of Europe for his forgotten country.

The United States is the great Nation it is because of the ideals and industry of its people. There are today 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry who have done so very much for our own country and in recognition of this fact, one of our main highways is known as the Pulaski Highway, which is part of U.S. 40.

Despite the fact that Poland still suffers under the enslavement of Soviet communism, the flame of freedom which Paderewski lighted remains alive and burns brightly.

The United States can do much to aid freedom in Poland and the restoration of independence to that ancient country is a purpose that will ever be near my heart and to the heart of all good Americans. We look forward to a bright new day when once again Poland will be a truly free and independent land in the community of the free world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to join with my colleagues to commemorate a major event in the historical battle for freedom and the right of people to establish their own form of government.

On May 3, 1791, Poland adopted a liberal constitution, patterned in many respects after our own revered American Constitution which had been written only 4 years before.

The Polish Constitution called for the separation of powers between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of Government. As in the case of the American Constitution, it was based on the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people, that sovereignty resides in the citizenry, not in the state itself.

Unlike our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution of May Third was never tested by time. Shortly after its adoption, Poland was overwhelmed and partitioned by the three neighboring empires: Russia, Austria, and Prussia. In spite of the fact that Poland was more advanced and enlightened than any of those three states, their combined power proved too strong.

Yet Poles in the homeland and around the world have never ceased to honor that golden moment in Polish history. Thus we too today turn our thoughts to the May 3 Constitution in this millennium year, plus one.

For us at this point in time there is an important lesson to be learned, a lesson in geopolitics. For despite the fact that two nations adopted constitutions of a progressive nature, one nation grew and prospered, the other was carved up among its neighbors.

Was it because of some superior morality which infused the Founding Fathers of this Nation? Was there some flaw in the Polish character which meant its doom? I think not.

The most significant difference, it seems to me, was geography. The United States occupies a large portion of a continent with friendly nations. Poland, on the other hand, is a small part of its

continent and historically has been surrounded by great powers.

The United States has been fortunate in being bounded by the great oceans and protected by strong naval forces, first the British and then our own U.S. Navy. Poland lies on a broad plain and is easily invaded.

Since we can be certain that these facts of geography will remain constant, we in America must try to understand how Poland's place in Europe has shaped the thinking of her leaders and her people. With such understanding we may be better able to see why recognition of the Oder-Neisse Line as Poland's eastern boundary is so important to the Poles. We may be better able to perceive what has happened—and why—since the 1956 October Revolution.

Understanding, it seems to me, is a better starting point for policy than condemnation.

Since 1960 I have had several opportunities to view conditions in Poland firsthand. As my mission reports have indicated, there is much which disturbs me in current Polish Government policies and society.

The Government has taken repressive actions against the church, which are inimical to man's freedom of religious practice.

Freedom to speak and to publish and to assemble are circumscribed.

Adherence to sterile Communist economic doctrines have, in fact, stunted Poland's economic growth and development.

Dependency upon the U.S.S.R. has required Poland to take actions and positions in international affairs which are in conflict with the interests and welfare of the West.

We certainly must not overlook these difficulties. At the same time, however, they should not be the cause for immediate condemnation and outright rejection of the Polish people. Rather, we should seek through diplomacy to foster forces of enlightenment within the Polish state.

In that regard, I applaud the recent agreement between Poland and the United States to postpone the payment of \$17 million which were to come due this year under past Public Law 480 surplus sales agreements.

In my study mission report of August 1965, following a visit to Poland, I noted:

The Poles have been meticulous in paying their obligations to the U.S. Government. These obligations arise from the settlement of our immediate post-World War II aid to Poland; Export-Import Bank loans extended during the late 1950's; settlement of claims of American nationals whose property in Poland was nationalized; and payments for Public Law 480 sales. Currently, the Poles are paying us, in U.S. dollars, \$13 to \$14 million annually under these various agreements. By 1967, however, these payments will double.

In the meantime, Poland has been put in a double squeeze by the action of the Congress last year (1) in making Poland ineligible for further sales under title I of Public Law 480 (sales for Polish zlotys), and (2) in providing that sales under title IV of Public Law 480 (sales for U.S. dollars) would have to be paid for in 5 years—as against 20 years for other countries. Their difficulty is compounded by the fact that under the terms of the last Public Law 480 sales agreement, the Poles consented to pur-

chase \$30 million worth of U.S. farm commodities on straight commercial terms, and another \$30 million worth on terms involving payment in U.S. dollars, in three annual installments.

Poland's purchases of U.S. surplus farm commodities under title I have averaged approximately \$50 million a year. By not being able to make additional purchases under title I, Poland is now forced to lay out increased amounts of very scarce hard currency earnings in order to meet its food and fiber needs. At the same time, as I already pointed out, her payments to the United States, in U.S. dollars, are about to double.

In order to meet both her commitments to the United States and the basic requirements for food of her people, Poland has to increase her hard currency earnings, obtain credits, or solve her problem through a combination of both.

Polish exports to the United States—approximately \$54 million last year—cannot increase fast enough to meet Poland's hard currency needs. It would seem to me, therefore, that the one area where some compromise may be possible involves the terms of trade under title IV sales (sales for U.S. dollars). In my view, the United States should be prepared to negotiate these terms in return for some specific concessions. Lack of forward planning in this field may lead to some undesirable consequences.

The agreement which subsequently has been worked out with the Polish Government by our very able Ambassador, the Honorable John Gronouski, is fully in keeping with my recommendations at that time.

Further, the United States has proposed to accept the payment in zlotys instead of dollars, with the money to be used to finance English-language teaching in Poland.

This provision will help insure that future generations of Poles will have an opportunity to learn to read and speak the language of Shakespeare, of Milton, of John Stuart Mill, of Thomas Jefferson, of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and of the U.S. Constitution.

Through the medium of language the young people of Poland will be able to learn of and understand the great Western concepts of man's dignity, his inalienable rights, including his right to liberty. Surely, such a program serves the interests of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Poland's future will not be an unbroken march toward Western ideals. There will be steps forward, and steps backward.

Through the element of an able and skilled diplomacy, we should try to maximize progression and minimize regression. In this effort our goal should always be that Poland overcome its geopolitical disadvantages in order that its people may live once again under the kind of enlightened government envisioned by the May 3 Constitution.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 176th anniversary of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791. This remarkable document established for the first time in Europe a constitutional monarchy and a responsible cabinet form of government. It reflected the ideals of a courageous people devoted to freedom. Tragically, this new form of government was never given a true test, as the Russian Army occupied Poland shortly after the ratification of the Constitution.

Throughout periods of oppression, and

frequent invasion and occupation, the Polish people have maintained a fierce desire and appreciation for freedom. Today, we who live in the free world are able to celebrate and applaud those wise individuals who framed the May 3 Constitution. However, in a Poland which is once again subjected to occupation and external control, celebration of the May 3 Constitution must be carried on in a secret manner, because the Soviet-controlled government has abolished the holiday. Despite this ban, the 3d of May remains a symbol to the people of Poland—a symbol of the free and independent life they long for.

Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware of the many scientific, political, and cultural contributions of the Polish people to our country, and to the free world. Their efforts have added significantly to the intellectual and economic development of Western civilization. This year marks the 150th anniversary of the death of a Pole who contributed greatly to the freedom of our own country. Thaddeus Kosciuszko loved liberty so much that he came to this country in 1776 to help us in our fight for independence in the Revolutionary War. Shortly after his arrival here, he was commissioned a colonel and served as an engineer in the Continental Army. The following year he became a part of the Northern Army, and supervised the construction of the outstanding fortifications at Van Schaick, Saratoga, and West Point. As both an engineer and fighter, Kosciuszko performed brilliantly with the American forces, serving with great distinction for over 6 years. Eventually, he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general. Throughout the Revolutionary War, and afterward, he impressed all who knew him with his devotion to the cause of liberty. Thomas Jefferson described him as "the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all, not only to the rich."

Thaddeus Kosciuszko remains the symbol of the freedom-loving Polish people. Today, as we recognize the achievements of Thaddeus Kosciuszko and the framers of the Constitution of May 3, we must not forget that there is a nation of Poles subjected to the will of an oppressing external government and deprived by their own government of the basic rights of man as set forth in the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations Charter. Our only consolation for this can be a feeling of confidence that these determined people will someday be free to develop a responsible and democratic government that will reflect their deep devotion to human rights.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to join my colleagues in tribute to a country and a people who have fought and endured foreign invaders throughout most of their history. I salute the gallant Poles, and people of Polish origin everywhere, on this anniversary of their mighty Constitution of May 3, 1791, which symbolizes for them the hope of all mankind for a government of their choice, free of terror and oppression.

I take pride in the many citizens of

Polish blood in my own district, who contribute to the life of my area the strength, vitality, and sheer joy of living so characteristic of their race. I share with them their prayers for the freedom of their fellow Poles across the sea, and the fulfillment implicit in the beautiful words of a document as great and as inspired as our own:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

They will recognize this stanza from a familiar Polish hymn, which expresses far better than any words of mine the longing in their hearts:

Boze cos Polske przez tak liczne wieki,
Otaczal blaskiem potegi i chwaly,
Cos Ja ochraniaj tarcza Swej opieki
Od nieszczesc ktore pognebic Ja mialy,
Przed Two oltarze zanosim blaganie,
Ojczyzne wolna racz nam zwrocic Panie.

O God, who, for so many centuries
Has granted to Poland the splendor of might
and glory,

Who, with the shield of Your protection,
Saved her from the misfortune designed to
destroy her;

Before Your Altars, we offer our prayers:
Return to us, O Lord, our free fatherland.

May that prayer be granted.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 176th anniversary of the adoption in Poland of the Constitution of 1791. Poles everywhere observe today as a national holiday, but those in Poland itself must do so silently.

The 3d of May Constitution was a flash of brilliance in Polish history, but did not save that country from further partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1795. Not until this century was Poland to again regain its independence—liberty that was to be again crushed—first by the planes and tanks of Nazi Germany in 1939 and then by Soviet tyranny.

The hopes of the Polish people, however, have never diminished and the spirit of liberalism which dictated this phrase from the 1791 Constitution, that "all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people," continues to inspire Poland's true patriots in the struggle for freedom.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that today, the 3d day of May, marks a significant occasion, that of commemorating the 73d anniversary of the constitutional history of Poland.

We are well aware of the Polish role in history—courageous in war—and dedicated to the arts and sciences in peace.

Today, another May 3, we find this occasion to be a silent national holiday. Silent, because the Communist regime is utilizing all its power to force the Polish people to forget the democratic glory of their history. The Polish people, nevertheless, despite oppression, are aware of their heritage.

Here in America we are grateful to have over 10 million citizens of Polish origin. Their presence needs no silence. Therefore, on this occasion I wish to salute the Americans of Polish origin and all Polish people throughout the world.

They are admirable people. They cherish and maintain the importance of the family institution. They possess energy for industry. Moreover, they retain their religious convictions. America is fortunate to include the people of Polish ancestry who have and are contributing immeasurably to the growth of our Nation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1967, Polish Constitution Day, we pause to honor the courageous people of Poland. The Constitution which they created 176 years ago today stands as a symbol of the democratic spirit which dwells yet in the hearts of the East Europeans. This is a day when we, as free American citizens, should rededicate ourselves to the principles of liberty and justice for all humanity, principles for which our own precious Constitution stands. All too often, we of the United States take our democratic society for granted. In paying tribute to the suppressed people of Poland, we become aware that many societies on this earth are not free, that many peoples are held in bondage, subject to governments whose doctrines they do not believe in. When we recall the tragedy of the Polish people, whose great Constitution was not permitted to stand, who suffered the tyranny of the czarist occupation, the devastating divisions of their great homeland, and eventual subjugation by the powerful Communist state, we are filled with sadness for them and their fleeting dream of democracy.

History tells us that scarcely had the great Constitution been signed before threats came from St. Petersburg to destroy all it stood for. A little army of 46,000 volunteers did all that was possible to defend their precious homeland. Against great odds they held back for a time the czarist invaders. The infinite courage and dedication of this small force brings back to us our feeling of inherent pride in our own ancestors, whose patriotism and unbending determination for America's liberty won for us forever the right to be free.

The U.S. Constitution and the 1791 Constitution of Poland were inspired by a like dream. Each expresses the same ideals of liberty and justice for all mankind. Each expresses the principle that man should be free to develop his personality, to fulfill his promise as an individual, and to realize his own aspirations. Like our Constitution, the Polish document was intended to create a favorable environment, a land of liberty, that this principle might be realized. To accomplish this, both provided for government by the will of the people, parliamentary representation for all citizens, like privileges for men regardless of birth, protection by law of the individual rights of the people, civil liberty and destruction of the barriers of class distinction, and absolute religious toleration.

Poland's May 3 Constitution was abolished as a "dangerous novelty." American citizens will never believe that the concept of man's inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is a dangerous novelty. One hundred seventy-six years have passed and still the spirit of freedom lives in the hearts of the captured people of Poland. Through the

years, the democratic tradition established in 1791 has evidenced itself many times in Polish history. Today, that document still stands as a precious symbol of liberty to the people of Eastern Europe.

On this May 3, we pledge to the people of Poland our faith in their will to freedom. Their dream of nationalism and their desire to create a land of liberty for all is not dead. The ideal of liberty dwells deep in the Polish soul and that spirit shall one day triumph. For, Mr. Speaker, what power on earth can stop a man, or a nation of men, that truly believes in freedom?

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, again this year I am greatly honored and privileged to join with my colleagues today in this commemorative program in the House marking Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791, as I have done every year since coming to Congress.

This Nation and the world are greatly indebted to the Polish people for their outstanding contributions and unstinted service and devotion to the cause of freedom down through the years. In our own country, persons of Polish descent can well recall with pride the heroic and illustrious service of Thaddeus Kosciuszko whose exploits in the American Revolution, particularly at the battle of Saratoga, helped to win French recognition of our independence.

Truly, this Nation owes a great debt going back to revolutionary days to people of Polish descent for their heroic service in our Armed Forces in time of danger and for their progressive citizenship, devoted support, and outstanding contributions in time of peace to well-being of our beloved country.

Many vicissitudes, trials, and tribulations have been visited upon the Polish nation since the May 3, 1791, Constitution, but always has the Polish zeal for freedom triumphed over cruel, relentless persecution. Today, the valiant Polish people are the victims of Communist oppression, but their consecrated belief in God and dedicated love of freedom shall again one day lead them to freedom and independence.

The Polish people do not seek to impose their wills upon any other peoples. They only pray and wish to be liberated from the iron grip of Marxist communism, which holds them in cruel serfdom. They strive and seek in every way to prevent the Communist tyranny from continuing its relentless will on them, their families, their communities, and their nation.

In a word, the Polish people are seeking to be released from bondage, to be permitted to resume their free way of life, to be rid of the oppression and cruel dictates of Communist oppression, which denies them in so many ways the right to life, liberty, and happiness and deprives them of their God-given rights as free men and women.

Americans have a special duty to the people of Poland and to their fellow citizens of Polish descent. This Nation must make it clear that it stands with the freedom-loving Polish people in every word and act designed to bring about independence and freedom to this unhappy land. We, in Congress, mindful

of the origins of our Nation and opposed as we are to tyranny, bondage, and oppression, should resolve to do everything in our power to encourage and sustain the Polish people, to strengthen them in their purpose to be free again, and to help them in every way we can to reach that dearly-sought goal of liberation and self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I have received from His Excellency, Aleksander Zawisza, Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-Exile in London, a copy of President Zaleski's special message on the occasion of Poland's National Day, the 176th anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791. I include this inspiring and informative statement along with my remarks, and heartily congratulate his Excellency, the President, upon his very impressive speech, and his able, courageous, effective leadership of the sacred cause of freedom which he represents:

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION

His Excellency August Zaleski, legitimate President of the Polish Republic, addressed the following message to the Polish nation on the occasion of Poland's National Day this year:

"On 3rd May 1791, the Polish nation enacted a new constitution based on the principle that 'all authority in human society derives from the will of the nation,' /art. V/. With a constitution founded on this principle, Poland became one of the most progressive countries of those times. But it also aroused the fears of her neighbors that she might introduce reforms to modernize her armed forces. Russia was the first to forestall this circumstance and her troops invaded the Polish Commonwealth. This was the signal for the further partitions of Poland.

"The same happened in 1839, when Russia again approached Germany with the proposal of yet another partition of Poland. Disregarding the differences between their socio-political systems, both these most imperialistic countries in Europe again concluded an alliance to which Poland fell victim.

"When Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia ultimately fell out over the division of their spoils, Russia willy-nilly found herself on the same side as Poland's western allies. The outcome was the joint victory over Germany for which Russia was paid with the freedom of eight independent countries in central Europe, including Poland.

"This severe blow at the ideal of justice and freedom cannot force the Polish nation to forgo its indubitable rights to independent existence. After all, world history for centuries past has shown that every lawless deed usually sooner or later ends up in disaster for those whose policies depend solely upon the exercise of power.

"Thus, there will be no real peace in the world until mankind acquires the conviction that lasting peace can be built only upon the tenets of justice and freedom.

"AUGUST ZALESKI."

LONDON, May 1967.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in observing today the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, a landmark in the thousand years of the Polish nation and a symbol of the spirit of liberty and democracy which continues to inspire and encourage both the people of Poland and freedom-loving persons around the globe.

This year we have special cause to

commemorate this day, for 1967 is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot, a hero of the American Revolution, and a champion of liberty throughout his life. In those stormy years, when many Western countries were racked by the struggle between the defenders of autocracy and the advocates of freedom, Kosciuszko's constant devotion to the cause of national independence and democracy was an inspiration to his own people, to Americans, and to like-minded men throughout the Western World. In our own time, his example should encourage us to recommit ourselves to serve the great principles to which he gave his best.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Polish nation has been a long, stirring struggle for national independence, and individual liberties. On this anniversary of the May Third Constitution, I want to join so many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the heritage of Poland, in sending sincere greetings to the Polish people, and in expressing our heartfelt hope that they will soon gain the increased freedom which they have sought with so much courage and fortitude.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, each year we in the Congress join with Polish-Americans throughout this country in commemorating the anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791. Today marks the 176th anniversary of that Constitution, whose traditions sustain the Polish people even under Communist rule. But there is much to celebrate today in addition to the anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Last year Polish people everywhere celebrated the millennium of Poland's identification as a nation. They also hailed the millennium of the birth of their Christian faith. Few nations can boast similar anniversaries. Both these anniversaries demonstrate that Poland has continued to live in spite of the many misfortunes of her long life.

Poles and Polish-Americans have made tremendous contributions to mankind in the arts and humanities, religion, science and government, and this year marks significant anniversaries of Polish individuals who have won fame in these fields.

This is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a patriot and national leader of Poland, one of America's Revolutionary War generals, an aide to George Washington and a friend of Thomas Jefferson. It is with justified pride that we recall his part in our struggles as a new nation. This year is also the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, who contributed to mankind's knowledge and use of physics through her pioneering work with radium.

As they enter the second year of their second millennium as a nation, Polish people everywhere can look back with pride on a long and impressive history and a record of significant contributions to world civilization. And they can look to a future made hopeful by their continuing faith and strong ideals.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 176th anniversary of the

adoption of the May 3 Polish Constitution. The Polish people's possession of their cherished democracy did not long endure. In 1795 the third partition of Poland ended the right of the Polish people to self-determination. Since that time, the Polish people have sought to exercise their love for freedom and democracy, but have been prevented from doing so by many unfortunate circumstances, including the presence of the Soviet Union at this time.

It is appropriate that this commemoration of the May 3 Constitution of 1791 should coincide with the observance of three other significant events in Polish history. Today marks the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot who served not only his native land, but also the efforts of his Nation to win its independence; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the brilliant Polish novelist whose works are a significant part of Western culture; and the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie, whose discovery of radium is considered to be one of the most important scientific discoveries of all time. The citizens of the United States acknowledge the great debt that they owe to the Polish people for the many contributions they have made to this country and to the world.

It is important that we who are so abundantly endowed with freedom take this opportunity to encourage and sustain the Polish people in their struggle to assert their national identity and to exercise their right of self-determination and love for freedom. Let us all honor the memory of the May 3 Polish Constitution and hope that at some future day the principles and spirit it embodied will again be the basis of government in Poland.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3d I am proud to pay tribute to the Polish people. The 1791 Constitution was enthusiastically received—both by Poles, who welcomed this opportunity to modernize their Government—and by friends of Poland who rejoiced at the peaceful undertaking of King Stanislaus and of the Polish Diet. Unfortunately, Poland was not to enjoy the "civil liberty and the good order of society" proclaimed by this document. She was quickly overrun in 1792 by the Russians and Prussians and subjected to a devastating partition. While the Russians threw out the 1791 Constitution they did not and could not take away from the Polish people the spirit of freedom and courage of conviction which inspired that charter.

Even today Poles express, whenever possible, their desire for freedom from domination and love of liberty. During last year's celebrations of Poland's millennium as a Christian nation, the Communist government realized that the Polish people would take this occasion to demonstrate their deeply religious fervor for their country and desire for its progress as a Christian nation. Not to be outdone, the Polish Government scheduled state celebrations to be held in competition with the church celebrations. But the Polish people continued to reject communism by supporting Cardinal

Wyszynski and other church leaders in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, we in the U.S. Congress join with our countrymen throughout the United States in anticipating a bright future for the Polish people, with every hope for the reinstatement of the ideals of the May 3 Constitution, so that Poland will once more be a voice of freedom in the world.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Poland commemorate their Constitution of May 3, 1791. The cornerstone of Polish independence and freedom was laid shortly after the promulgation and adoption of our own Constitution of 1787. Unfortunately, while the United States has enjoyed over a century and three-quarters of constitutional government, the Poles have, except for the period between the two World Wars, spent these years under the successive tyrannies of the czars and the commissars. Today while scores of new nations dot the continents of Africa and Asia, Poland is but another of the numerous colonies that comprise the Soviet Empire.

I am reminded, on this historic occasion, of the contributions to American independence that were made by two Polish soldiers who loved freedom so much that they crossed the Atlantic and helped the infant United States in its struggle against Great Britain. For a few minutes I want to discuss the achievements of Kosciuszko, who built the Military Academy at West Point, and Pulaski, who founded the U.S. Cavalry.

Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura Kosciuszko, who was born in Poland February 12, 1746, was known as the hero of two worlds. In August 1776, he arrived in America, where his military and engineering ability was immediately put to use in the service of the new republic. He constructed fortifications at various points, including Saratoga. The victory at Saratoga turned the tide for the Americans and led to France's recognition of the independence of the United States. Kosciuszko's contribution to that victory was recognized by his superiors and he was entrusted with the task of constructing the fortifications at West Point. It was the Polish volunteer who first suggested that a national military school be established there.

Altogether, he fought for 6 years in the American Army. In 1783 the Congress acknowledged his "long, faithful, and meritorious service" by conferring upon him the rank of brigadier general. The gallant soldier died October 15, 1817.

While there was triumph for Tadeusz Kosciuszko in America, there was only sadness for him in his native Poland, which was doomed to remain under the Russian despotism. Today America continues to enjoy her freedom while Poland remains subjugated by her giant neighbor. Although the tyranny bears a different label than it did in Kosciuszko's day, it is nonetheless a tyranny.

Another famous Polish soldier, Casimir Pulaski, was born 1748 and arrived in America in 1777. Pulaski, a brigadier general, founded the U.S. Cavalry. He led both the American Cavalry and the French Cavalry during the siege of Savannah. Pulaski did not live to witness

the triumph of American arms, as he was wounded at Savannah on October 9, 1779. He died 2 days later.

Mr. Speaker, we who live in the United States today owe an unpayable debt to those brave early Americans who fought for independence from Great Britain. While we honor these men for the part they played in securing freedom for America, let us also salute the gallant soldiers who came here from other lands to help light the torch of freedom. High on the roll of distinguished foreigners who aided us in our struggle for independence we must place the names of Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today is Polish Third of May Constitution Day and wherever there are citizens of Polish descent across the world, they are silently observing this national Polish holiday. I wish to join with my Polish brothers in this remembrance.

One hundred and seventy-six years ago this day, Poland adopted the Constitution that is still quietly followed by Poles everywhere.

In the face of the Communist tyranny now ruling their homeland, the Poles strengthen and renew their national fervor this day.

Their courage is increased by the memory of the strong years before: The Poles ask that once again their land be made free and independent.

This year's observances are fourfold. In addition to the day itself, three salient anniversaries of Polish-born heroes are being observed: The 150th anniversary of the death of Count Thaddeus Kosciuszko, America's Revolutionary War hero and aid to George Washington; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, great man of literature and author of "Quo Vadis"; and the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the woman who discovered and defined the fundamental properties of the atom.

I ask that all Americans take several moments to meditate on the importance of this day with our Polish brothers.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the stalwart Polish people on this Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

It was on this day in 1791—not long after the adoption of our own Constitution—that Poland succeeded in reforming her public life by adopting a Constitution which declared that "all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people." Unfortunately, this light of liberalism emanating from Poland was viewed by her Prussian and Russian neighbors as a threat to their absolutist form of government, and in 1795 these two nations sent their military forces to partition and plunder freedom-loving Poland.

As we reflect on this momentous historic event, we are reminded, once again, that tyranny cannot coexist with freedom, and that freedom will ultimately prevail. This anniversary also calls to mind the common bond between the American and Polish peoples who share a deep dedication to the cause of liberty and the rights of man.

On this occasion let us join the thou-

sands of Polish-Americans, who have contributed so magnificently to the growth and security of our country, in reaffirming our hope that the courageous, liberty-loving Polish people may soon have a government entirely of their own choosing which will permit them to live again in peace and freedom.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad again to have the honor of participating in these ceremonies commemorating the Polish Constitution of 1791. Once again, I pause to reflect upon the long and glorious history of a people long devoted to those principles of individual freedom and democracy which we in America hold so dear. Once again, I am reminded of the oppression and tyranny which have subjugated those proud, free people, almost continuously during the last quarter century. First, there was the terror of Adolph Hitler which haunted the land from 1939 to the end of the Second World War. Then, there were the Communists, who still hold the country in their grips. Once again, I am profoundly saddened.

I am saddened that Poland and so many other captive nations, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world, still are not free to determine their own destinies. It is an ugly fact that there are hundreds of millions of people on this unhappy globe, clamoring for freedom, yearning to live without fear and intimidation, and struggling to keep alive the spark of hope that one day they shall truly enjoy the sweet fruit of their fondest aspirations.

To the people of Poland I say: Do not abandon hope. To the millions of other subjugated people in this world my plea is the same. With a conviction at least as strong as the Communist resolve, we in this country are dedicated to halting the spread of this menace and bringing back to the persecuted peoples of the world the freedom for which they yearn. With unswerving confidence that the cause to which we are committed is a just one, we are prepared to be unrelenting in our struggle. And, we shall prevail. Freedom, truth, and justice, the principles which are the bulwark of popular democracy, shall not be permitted to die.

To the gallant people of Poland I say also: Persevere in your resistance. You persevered even when the ominous shadow of Hitler had spread over so much of Europe. Warsaw in 1944 stands as a shining example of your heroism. There is excellent reason for you to continue your perseverance.

On this 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, we here in this Congress join the people of Poland in a rededication to the ideals which we mutually cherish. It is our fervent prayer that Poland once again shall be free.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your permission to take these few moments to mark the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Through the adoption of the Constitution in 1791, Poland was transformed into a modern state. The Constitution was adopted at a critical time in Polish history. In 1772, Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory. Facing possible anni-

hilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new Constitution which was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

History has recorded the sad and dismal events which have taken place since that date and the anniversary of the Polish Constitution is not mentioned in Poland today. It is, however, observed by the many Polish communities in the free world, especially in the United States, and I wish to take this opportunity to call this date to the attention of all of the wonderful people of Polish extraction in order that they may know this important holiday is not forgotten.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this week we mark the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. While we are free here in the United States to speak out publicly in commemoration of this triumph of liberty, those who live in Poland today must mark it as a silent holiday. The democratic impulse of the 1791 Constitution has been silenced by the oppression of a Communist regime, but it has not been stilled. Millions of Poles join with us in rededicating ourselves to the pursuit of freedom for Eastern Europe. As we observe this anniversary, we are reminded also this year of the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the Polish patriot who gave so much to American liberty. His spirit gives courage to us all in the struggle for freedom.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to those of my colleagues who are of Polish descent, to the millions of Americans with Polish ancestors, and to loyal Poles everywhere.

On May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution, the people of Poland adopted the first democratic Constitution to be recognized by a European nation. Their proclamation of liberalism was formulated in these words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Since then, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate this birth of European liberalism as a Polish national holiday. But the celebration goes beyond the boundaries of one nation or the ties of a common ancestry. Free men everywhere, and those who would be free but for the domination of an oppressive power, all share a common dedication to the cause of liberty; they look to the Polish Constitution of May 3 as a symbol of that liberty and as a source of inspiration, for it gives reassurance to the free and hope to the oppressed.

Unfortunately, Poland was and is surrounded by powerful, acquisitive neighbors, and her periods of freedom have been short. Just 4 years after adopting the Constitution, Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria for the third time. In this century Poland has been devastated twice by war and has been dominated by Communist regimes

for the past 22 years. In this context the Polish Constitution assumes a special significance; it represents not the government of a free country but the spirit of a people who desire to be free.

Successive generations of Poles both at home and abroad have continued to dream and struggle for liberty. We all remember the heroic fight waged by the Poles in exile during World War II; Franklin D. Roosevelt called it, "an inspiration to mankind." We in America owe them a special debt for the dedication of the Polish patriots who joined us in our own fight for independence.

Therefore, we should take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to Polish freedom. As long as the light of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Polish people we must not abandon their cause. Their unconquerable spirit is a guarantee that Poland, although presently burdened with a Communist imposed regime, will one day throw off its oppressive chains and once again claim its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Polish people is full of tragic events. That was particularly true during the late 18th century when their country was parceled out three times, and finally they lost their independence and freedom. Before its final partition a group of patriotic statesmen did something that is remembered not only by them alone, but also by other lovers of democracy and independence. In 1791 they drew up and adopted a constitution which, for its liberal and progressive features, made a grand landmark in Poland's political history.

By that Constitution, Poland emerged from medieval times and stepped into the modern age. By one stroke Poland's Government was transformed from absolute monarchy to one of limited monarchy. A cabinet form of government, with parliamentary responsibility, was established. Religious toleration was guaranteed. The electorate was enlarged, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old and unwieldy system were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. In short, this was a liberal-democratic constitution, something quite new in that part of Europe until then.

The Constitution of 1791 was never put into force, and the Poles never had the joy of living under it, for immediately after its promulgation, Poland was faced with invasion and final extinction as an independent state. But the spirit of that Constitution has lived on, and today it lives in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles. On the observance of its 176th anniversary we pay tribute to the memory of the framers of that great and imperishable document.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is right and proper that all Americans join in observing this 176th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, that noble document modeled after our own Constitution. The national commitment to free and democratic institutions, as proclaimed in the Constitution of May 3, lives still in the hearts of the Polish

people in the mother country and in other lands throughout the world.

In the words of the Constitution:

All Power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is tragic that the gallant Poles have been so cruelly thwarted in their persistent efforts to move forward as a free nation, first by partition by the empires of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, and later by the totalitarian forces of nazism and communism. The United States championed Poland's right to freedom at the end of the First World War and gladly witnessed the rebirth of the new Poland which tragically was engulfed by the forces of nazism in 1939. At the end of the last war we did our very best to see a free and independent Poland, but unfortunately we were not successful. Today we hope and pray that the indomitable will and brave spirit of the people of Poland will sustain them until their longed-for liberation into a free and independent country can be achieved.

On this the 176th anniversary of the Constitution, I am happy to send sincere greetings to the people of Poland and also to express the genuine appreciation and immense debt which the United States owe our citizens of Polish ancestry. The dedication of the Polish people to the principles of their Constitution is the best assurance that one day their land will again stand in full freedom and independence.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on passage of the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 9481, of a few minutes ago, my plane was delayed in arriving and I was stranded at the airport and further delayed due to heavy traffic.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye," on final passage.

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much impressed by the outstanding accomplishments of the Ford Foundation in Central America and Mexico.

Recently, I received a report on this work from Elihu Bergman, an old friend

of mine, who is now doing a remarkable job as assistant representative of the foundation's Mexico office. Many of my colleagues in this House will remember him in his former association with the VISTA program.

I commend this report to the attention of my colleagues, as evidence of important work in a vital field.

The report follows:

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

The Ford Foundation is a private, non-profit institution whose purpose is to advance human welfare.

The Foundation seeks to strengthen society by identifying key problems and issues, and by underwriting efforts—by institutions, communities, government agencies, and individuals—toward their solution. Within its fields of concern, the Foundation grants funds for experimental, demonstration, and developmental programs designed to achieve progress.

The Foundation was founded in 1936 by Henry Ford and his son Edsel. Until 1950 it made grants largely to charitable and educational institutions in the state of Michigan. In 1950 The Ford Foundation became an international philanthropy, and nearly all its grants have been made since then.

The Foundation is an independent institution; independent of the Ford Motor Company and its affiliates; and independent of the U.S. government.

The Ford Foundation is the largest private philanthropy in the world. To date it has granted nearly \$3 billion to more than 5000 institutions in the United States and 78 foreign countries. In the fiscal year that ended on September 30, 1966, the Foundation distributed \$341.6 million, including \$59.0 million to programs in 78 countries outside the United States.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Ford Foundation has devoted increasing attention to the process of human development outside the United States. In its international programs the Foundation typically supports efforts to accumulate, transmit, and utilize knowledge that will penetrate barriers to national and regional progress.

The Foundation most frequently provides grants to accelerate and expand the work of universities, research institutes, public and private institutions, and individuals, directly related to the critical needs of developing societies. These needs are reflected in fields where the Foundation has supplied resources: Expansion of educational opportunities; increasing food production; problems of expanding population; teaching and application of science and technology; creation of managerial skills; urbanization; and improved comprehension of social and economic processes.

In allocating its resources for international programs, the Foundation responds to initiatives from local individuals and institutions. Generally, the Foundation seeks a partnership in which the local institution shares the cost of a new enterprise. The Foundation is concerned that an enterprise for which it grants initial support becomes self-sustaining; that after termination of Foundation support the institution or program is assured of local support.

Outside of Latin America, The Ford Foundation has field offices in: Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Algeria, Nigeria, the Congo, Kenya, Pakistan, India, Malasia, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAMS

The Ford Foundation supports developmental programs in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala,

Honduras, Nicaragua, the West Indies, and Mexico.

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN MEXICO

The Ford Foundation has functioned in Mexico since 1962. To date, the Foundation has provided 29 grants totaling 110 million pesos (\$8.8 million) to support programs directed toward meeting priority Mexican social and economic developmental objectives:

1. Development and implementation of a modern agricultural technology through education, research and extension; expanding food production for improved quantity and quality; development of economic research as a basis for agricultural policy.

National School of Agriculture, Chapingo

Architectural services for campus development.

Construction of administration and extension buildings.

Modernization of the library and establishment of a Statistics and Computing Center.

Fellowships in agricultural extension; agricultural economics; and related fields.

Creation of an integrated program of agricultural education, research, and extension.

Provision of visiting faculty members from Iowa State University for graduate programs in agricultural economics and statistics.

Establishment of a Center of Agricultural Economics at the Post Graduate College.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Initiation of an instructional program in agricultural extension.

Development of a new program in food technology and marine sciences.

University of Coahuila

Development of a secondary school to produce agricultural technicians; provision of consultants from Texas A&M University for the school.

Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock, United Mexican States

Creation of a more effective nationwide production oriented system of agricultural extension to transmit research results to farmers, and farm production and management problems to the laboratories.

2. Expansion of educational opportunity throughout the country; enlarging the capacities of institutions of higher learning.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Establishment of educational television facilities for oncampus instruction, and use by primary schools and adult education programs in the Monterrey area.

National Autonomous University of Mexico

Establishment of a multipurpose language laboratory for regular language instruction; training of secondary school teachers; demonstration; and linguistic research.

Inter-American center for scholarly books

Creation of a regional facility in Mexico for the interchange of books among the academic communities of North and South America.

Academic administration internship program

One year non-degree program of study and experience at several U.S. universities for young Mexican academic administrators.

3. Meeting the challenge of vigorous economic growth and profound social change; production of trained manpower to deal effectively with these phenomena.

University of Nuevo Leon

Strengthening of the undergraduate program in economics through fellowships, use of visiting faculty, library development, faculty training, and the creation of research facilities.

El Colegio de Mexico

Creation of a Center for Economic and Demographic Studies, with teaching, research, and library physical facilities.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Development of a Graduate School of Management to produce skilled managerial personnel for public and private enterprise, and for teaching.

4. Responding to the technological requirements of a rapidly advancing society by cultivating an appreciation of science in the educational process, and by assisting institutions to improve educational programs in the science and engineering disciplines.

Academy of Scientific Research

Enhancement of the role and potential of science in Mexican life by a system of post-doctoral fellowships; prizes for scientific achievements; lectures, seminars, and conferences; and the provision of short courses in provincial universities.

National Polytechnical Institute—Center for Research and Advanced Studies

Creation of high quality departments of electrical and chemical engineering through faculty development, fellowship opportunities, and the availability of research facilities.

National Autonomous University of Mexico

Elevation of the quality and capacity of the Graduate School of Engineering, with emphasis on 1) Encouraging students to enter the teaching profession; and 2) Providing opportunities for students from the provincial areas of Mexico.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Development of a superior Faculty of Science and Engineering through the provision of opportunities for faculty improvement; fellowships for advanced study abroad; and research facilities. Simultaneous creation of a fellowships program designed to further train faculty members from provincial universities.

National Association of Faculties and Schools of Engineering (ANFEI)

Improvement of the calibre of professors of engineering through a fellowship program that will provide short graduate level courses in fields where their training is not adequate for progressing teaching requirements.

5. Exploring the social, medical, and economic problems of a rapidly expanding population.

Mexican Institute of Social Studies

Accomplishment of a nation-wide survey of prevailing knowledge, attitudes, and practices of family planning.

Mexican Institute of Social Security

Establishment of a teaching and research program in reproductive biology emphasizing a study of the epidemiology and control of abortion.

Woman's Hospital, Mexico City

Creation of a teaching, research, and demonstration program in reproductive biology, involving physicians, graduate and student nurses, health aides, and medical students from the Federal District and provincial areas.

Hospital of Nutritional Diseases, Mexico City

Establishment of a research department in human reproduction, including clinical and laboratory facilities for research on reproduction, and a post-doctoral program in reproductive biology primarily for physicians from provincial universities.

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Since 1962 the Ford Foundation has granted \$2.35 million for 12 projects directed toward meeting educational development goals of the Republic of Central America.

Guatemala

The American School

Expansion of a university-level admissions and achievement testing program for use by Central American institutions of higher learning.

Honduras

National Autonomous University of Honduras

Creation of an integrated general studies program designed to upgrade the quality of undergraduate education, the provision of visiting faculty, and improvement of facilities.

Nicaragua

National University of Nicaragua

Installation of a liberal arts curriculum, comparable to the general studies program at the University of Honduras, to better prepare first year undergraduates for subsequent work in the specialized professional schools of the University. Provision of visiting faculty and improvement of facilities.

University of El Salvador

Development of an undergraduate basic sciences program as the first step in an integrated general studies curriculum. Provision of visiting faculty and laboratory facilities to backstop the enterprise.

Costa Rica

University of Costa Rica

Strengthening of an existing general studies program by the provision of resources for additional full-time faculty, visiting faculty, development of central library facilities, and augmentation of the administrative capacity of the institution.

Development of a high quality program for training secondary school teachers designed to serve as a model for Central America, and involving students from other Central American countries, with emphasis on the substance and teaching of the natural sciences and mathematics.

Central America Regional

Higher Councils of Central American Universities (CSUCA)

Equipping of the Higher Council to meet its responsibilities for the integration of Central American higher education—the provision of guidance and support to the participating universities for an organization of their educational resources that will produce the most effective regional pattern.

Production of a model survey of current and long range Central American needs for university trained manpower.

THE SIERRA CLUB—DEFENDER OF OUR NATURAL HERITAGE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the Diamond Jubilee of an organization that has become one of the most important forces in the conservation movement in this Nation today: the Sierra Club. I am proud to rise in tribute to the founders, officers, and members of this group for the great public services they have performed, and for the courageous leadership which has earned them the respect of all who are concerned with conserving our rich natural heritage.

The Sierra Club was founded 75 years ago this coming June 4, by the great naturalist and pioneer conservationist John Muir, who gathered with him 26 like-minded men.

Dedicated at the outset to the exploration, enjoyment, and protection of the mountain regions of the Pacific coast, particularly of Yosemite and the Sierra Nevada, the Sierra Club has since broadened its mandate to include the scenic resources of the entire Nation.

The club's conservation goals often place it at cross purposes with powerful commercial interests—and sometimes, with governmental policy. But it is universally admired and respected, I believe, for the courage with which it fights for what it believes is right and for the energy with which it musters public support for important conservation issues. Even those who oppose the club's efforts to defend scenic and other national resources must recognize and respect this great fighter for conservation.

Opponents of Sierra Club programs, who often have vast economic interests at stake, have accused the club of impeding progress or of self-interest in its efforts to preserve resources for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations.

If progress means massive and wanton destruction of irreplaceable resources, then let us impede it. I do not call this progress at all. Even from a strictly economic point of view squandering of natural resources makes no sense.

The Sierra Club makes no profit. It gains nothing except deficits, hard words, and the satisfaction of helping to preserve and improve utilization of our dwindling forest land, wildlife, waters, and other precious natural resources.

When it was first founded, the club drew its membership almost entirely from the San Francisco area. But the growing public interest and concern over conservation, which the club itself spurred, had wider appeal and soon had members in every State of the Union.

Traditionally, from the time of John Muir to the present day, the Sierra Club has drawn much of its strength from the devotion of its unpaid volunteer leadership. Officers and directors of the club have always served without remuneration, contributing generously of time borrowed from their busy professional careers. I take pleasure in according well-deserved public recognition to Dr. George Marshall, president; Edgar Wayburn, vice president; Frederick Eissler, secretary; William Siri, treasurer; Lewis Clark, fifth officer; and directors Ansel Adams, Paul Brooks, Nathan Clark, Pauline Dyer, Jules Eichorn, Richard Leonard, Martin Litton, Charlotte Mauk, John Oakes, and Eliot Porter.

Fifteen years ago, the officials of the Sierra Club recognized that the growing workload required a permanent paid staff to carry out the programs to which the club is dedicated. Happily, they selected as their first executive secretary, Mr. David Brower, who had served as a volunteer for 18 years.

Members of the Sierra Club and, indeed, all concerned with sound conservation, have reason to be pleased with the choice of David Brower, for the record of the past 15 years is impressive. Club membership, which numbered a little more than 7,000 when Mr. Brower was appointed, had swelled to 50,000. Over

the past 3 years, the membership more than doubled. Of course, opinions will vary upon this achievement. Those who in the past have plundered our natural resources—those who have a vested interest in exploiting them in the future—must regard such growing strength in the conservation movement as a grave threat. Those who would prefer to enjoy what has been saved and who fear the battle to save more, must be discomfited. But those of us who believe that we must fight to preserve our natural heritage and prevent ruthless despoliation can only be grateful.

There is another and even more important achievement represented in this phenomenal growth: the ability of the Sierra Club, through Mr. Brower, to stimulate a broad public awareness of the importance of conservation. As many opposed interests know to their sorrow, a conservation issue is now a national issue, and when the Sierra Club speaks on an issue, that voice is heard and heeded in Congress and throughout the land. For this accomplishment alone, the club, its directors, and Mr. Brower, have earned our gratitude and the thanks of future generations.

One of Mr. Brower's most notable efforts in behalf of the Sierra Club over the past 6 years has been to edit, design, and produce a series of more than a dozen of the most beautiful books ever published in this country, such works of art as "Time and the River Flowing"; "Grand Canyon"; "In Wilderness Is the Preservation of the World"; "Summer Island"; "Penobscot Country"; "This Is the American Earth." Through these books, millions of Americans have been awakened to the beauty of our natural heritage and have learned the important lesson of conserving it under wise stewardship. There are many who believe the Sierra Club's much-honored exhibit format series rivals the finest work of European craftsmen. Indeed, in 1964, the series won for the club the book industry's highest honor, the Carey-Thomas Award, as the most distinguished example of creative publishing in the United States.

Because the Sierra Club has become such an effective adversary of many powerful interests, both public and private, it is inevitable that the club's principal spokesman should be a target for criticism and abuse. I understand the inevitability of this, and I am sure that Mr. Brower understands it too. But I believe that, when the heat of the battle is over and issues laid to rest, even his fiercest opponents would join in honoring the great achievements and services of Mr. Brower and the organization he serves. He is a man who represents a growing body of public opinion, and represents it exceedingly well.

Looking back over what the Sierra Club has achieved over the past 15 years, I feel sure that even those who have opposed the club can join in saying the quality of American life would be poorer without the Sierra Club, and the Sierra Club would be poorer without David Brower. I congratulate both and wish them many more years of public service.

THE QUIE AMENDMENT WOULD END EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION IN OUR LOCAL SCHOOLS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, for years the greatest need in education at the local level has been for resources to solve new and traditional problems of education and learning. In many instances local schools, because of a lack of financial ability, have not been able to incorporate new programs and new services into their curricula.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has provided local school districts with the resources to initiate new programs and to supplement existing programs and practices.

Title III provides funds for supplementary education centers and services which help to translate the latest knowledge about teaching and learning in widespread educational practice.

Its success has been based on the results of unique cooperation between Federal, State, and local educational agencies.

H.R. 8983, the Quie amendment, would put an end to title III and destroy a living example of creative federalism in education.

Educational innovation and experimentation is desperately needed today. We are trying to change the kinds of education offered our children, and we are also trying to make certain that full equality of educational opportunity is achieved. Funds from title III have permitted local school agencies to move ahead in these areas. But local school districts and boards of education need more help than State agencies can supply. They need the help and national expertise which the U.S. Office of Education has been able to supply.

Abolition of title III, as we know it today, would assure that innovation in local schools will decline. Without Federal funds, local school districts will simply not have the adequate resources to look beyond the horizons to seek answers to tomorrow's problems.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 9883, because it would return a provincial attitude toward education, when education has become, in reality, a national concern.

EXTENSION OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce today legislation to

amend and extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965. As the President said in his recent message on Older Americans, passage of this bill in 1965 marked a major commitment by the Congress "not merely to prolong our citizens' lives, but to enrich them."

Today, over 19 million Americans—about 10 percent of our total population—are aged 65 or over. This figure represents both a triumph over disease and illness and a challenge to the future. For many of our elderly are doomed to be poor, to be lonely, to be purposeless, in their post-productive years:

5,300,000 older Americans have yearly incomes below the poverty level.

Only one out of five has a job, often at low wages.

Over 2 million elderly citizens are on welfare.

Nearly 40 percent of our single older citizens have total assets of less than \$1,000.

Because we have enacted the Older Americans Act, we have established a new agency with special responsibility, competence, and compassion for the problems of the elderly. The Administration on Aging, ably headed by William Bechill, tries to effectively channel existing resources and programs into developing services and programs for the elderly.

To carry out these responsibilities, in addition to its coordination activities at the Federal level, the Administration on Aging administers three grant programs which are designed to encourage the development of programs on aging in States and local communities, to conduct research into new techniques, for improving services for older people, and to train professional and other technical personnel in the field of aging.

By the end of 1966 some 39 project grants had been awarded to agencies and institutions in 25 different States to conduct research into different areas, including special kinds of demonstrations of new ways to deliver services to older people. During the program's first year, nearly 200 local community projects for older people had been funded which included community planning activities, programs for older people in senior activity centers, counseling and referral services, programs in senior housing projects, recreation programs, and consumer information and guidance programs.

The amendments I am introducing today would extend the Older Americans Act from 1972 through 1974. They would also extend the separate grant provisions through 1972 instead of allowing them to expire, as presently written, in 1970. By raising the authorization levels for the State grants program from \$8 million in fiscal 1967 to \$10,550,000 for fiscal 1968, the States would be able to fund from 250 to 300 new projects.

An increase from \$3 million to \$6,400,000 in authorizations for the research, demonstration, and training grants programs would provide for the continuation of about 49 projects which were started in 1966 and 1967. This authorization would also fund some 70 to 80 new projects, as well as provide for a major new nutritional program to test new

methods for meeting the nutritional needs of older people.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Older Americans Act has already well proven its effectiveness and need, and that it deserves a vote of confidence to extend its life and increase its funds.

FINANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the annual Gabriel Silver lecture devoted to world peace, at Columbia University, was delivered this year on April 13 by Mr. George D. Woods, President of the World Bank. In his address entitled "Finance for Developing Countries: A Time for Decision," Mr. Woods offers a frank and objective view of foreign assistance since the Marshall Plan—the motivations, goals, achievements, and mistakes of our foreign aid program. He does not present a sugar-coated version of foreign aid history, but rather points out where the program has not been as effective as anticipated, why, and how this experience can be applied constructively toward new directions in the aid program.

Mr. Woods recognizes the great need for foreign assistance and stresses our ability to help underdeveloped countries. He says:

We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the riches of the world, to help many millions to escape hunger and to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time.

I include Mr. Woods' address as part of my remarks:

FINANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A TIME FOR DECISION

(By George D. Woods)

President Kirk, Dean Cordier, ladies and gentlemen: It was an act of bravery for Dean Cordier to invite a banker to come here this evening to deliver the annual Gabriel Silver Lecture Devoted to World Peace. It has been the misfortune of bankers to be recorded in history more often in connection with panic than with peace; and I can hope to reward the dean's audacity only in a modest way. Nevertheless, I was delighted to accept his flattering invitation to speak here at Columbia University. Since then I have been emboldened by Pope Paul's recent encyclical, according to which "The new name for peace is development."

We are now approaching the 20th anniversary of the inception of the Marshall Plan—the date when Secretary of State Marshall, at a time of deep economic and political crisis in Europe, spoke the sentences which launched the great cooperative effort of the European Recovery Program. Secretary Marshall's initiative began a transformation. The creative genius of Europe awoke. American aid began to flow out steadily to the sixteen countries which had united in the Recovery Program. Those countries, later joined by others, worked their way back to productivity; they formed new habits of collaboration which, as is now apparent

to all, opened the way to an economic revolution.

Today, there is another such crisis in the world. It is big, it lacks focus; most of us do not even think of it as a crisis. But food riots in Asia, government coups in Africa, student violence in this Hemisphere and elsewhere, are among the symptoms of it. It is the crisis of a new world trying to be born—the crisis of the developing countries in their struggle to achieve economic viability, national unity, and the respect of other nations.

This new world contains about two billion people—about two-thirds of humanity. Most of it is hungry most of the time. Average calorie consumption is on the order of 2,000 a day—an intake which in Europe two decades ago, we regarded as being dangerously near the famine level. Between the income of an ordinary citizen in western Europe and that of an ordinary African or Asian, the disparity is 10 or 15 to one, with the contrast that implies between standards of shelter and education, work and enjoyment. In the case of the United States, the figure would be 20 to one.

Thanks to modern medicine, underdeveloped countries enjoy a 20th century death rate; but they still are experiencing a 19th century birth rate. As a consequence, five-sixths of the population growth in the world is occurring in the less developed countries. Of the 60-million increase which we can expect in 1967, 50 million will be in countries with per capita incomes of less than \$250 a year. Such a rate of population growth has never before occurred over such a wide part of the globe.

The existence of hundreds of millions of destitute human beings in the world is a threat to peace. We see every day how it may create vacuums of authority into which the great powers may be drawn in uneasy confrontation. The chances of disagreement and disaster can be magnified by what happens in places of Africa, Asia and Latin America that many of us had not even heard of ten years ago.

Over the years, rich nations have been engaged in extensive but largely uncoordinated efforts to help the poor. The pattern is different from that of the Marshall Plan: instead of one principal country trying to help a dozen, there are now more than a score of countries engaged in various efforts to help about a hundred others. These activities have grown haphazardly, for the most part from former colonial responsibilities, in some part from humanitarian or diplomatic or commercial motives. They have not—and I want to emphasize this—they have not been the result of conscious commitments to a coherent, cooperative attack on the problems of world poverty and disorder. This has not been tried.

The task of development assistance has proved to be one of almost infinite complexity. The process of growth, whether of people or countries is intricate, and when its intricacy is compounded by all the difficulties of relationships between sovereign nations, problems seem to arise in a limitless number of permutations and combinations.

The effort of some countries to help others has been freighted with irony and paradox. The very economic strength that gives rich countries the means to help the poor also opens up a gap between them: the capital-intensive technology of the industrial countries is not all suited to the problems of the low-income nations.

It is a paradox, too, to speak of development assistance as "foreign aid." In fact, as we all know, in the past much development assistance has been given in forms designed to benefit the immediate self interest of the giver—forms rather different from those which would have been followed had economic development been the prime objective,

and rather different also from those which would have been followed if performance by the developing country had been an important consideration.

Most providers of aid, sooner or later, and in one form or another, have used overseas assistance as a subsidy for their own industries—as a way of exporting goods and services at higher than world prices. It is estimated that the donor countries put a value on their annual aid about \$1 billion a year higher than the same goods and services would bring in competitive world markets. And it goes without saying that when development finance has been used to protect spheres of political and commercial influence, or to serve strategic military purposes, it has been to some extent of help to the donor countries themselves.

To win for aid programs the support of legislators with many vexing problems of their own—including poverty pockets and other high-priority domestic demands for public funds—all these motives of self-interest have been proclaimed publicly and often in donor countries. Small wonder, then, that development assistance has not infrequently failed to stir feelings of gratitude or to encourage the performance that was expected from the recipient countries.

The paradoxes have not all been on the side of the rich. Not a few developing countries, for instance, have asked for help from abroad at the same time as they have been practicing forms of nationalism that make international cooperation impossible. While governments and leaders have proclaimed economic development to be high on their list of goals, they often have failed to take the action and adopt the policies necessary to achieve it. Despite the popularity of the phrase, "revolution of rising expectations," the sadder truth is that in many countries, the population lacks the ferment of aspiration and determination without which economic development is impossible. In some countries, deep-seated political instability has undermined the hope of steady economic progress.

Some paradoxes have trapped both donor and recipient. Consider the irony that development assistance, instead of hastening the day when the poor countries could make their own way, may in some cases actually have postponed it. Exports of American food surpluses have fed the hungry overseas; in their time they have saved the United States Government several hundred million dollars a year which otherwise it would have had to spend on crop storage and price support operations; but food aid programs have not always been administered so as effectively to stimulate increases in production in agricultural sectors overseas. Aid programs have helped recipients, on occasion, to defer or avoid the hard measures they should have been taking on their own behalf. Aid has given donors an excuse—although not a good one—to defer liberalizations of their own commercial policy which might enlarge the trade earnings of developing countries and thus lessen their reliance on development aid.

Despite its contradictions and paradoxes, in two decades, development assistance has accomplished much good. I think, indeed, that this period since the Second World War will be remembered in history as the period when the engineering of social and economic progress in the developing world first became a universal preoccupation of governments. There has been planted, literally and figuratively, seeds whose fruit the developing countries will be harvesting for many years. For millions of human beings, the development effort has been the difference between life and death; for millions more, it has been the beginning of hope; and for some it has been the beginning of prosperity.

Installed power capacity in developing countries has more than doubled in the last

dozen years. Cement production has more than doubled; the manufacture of steel has tripled; mining production is rising at a rate of almost 10 per cent a year. Commerce is growing: freight moved by rail has been increasing annually by 10 per cent in Africa and 12 percent in Asia. The expansion of education, that vital springboard of economic advance, is proceeding significantly faster than the growth of population. All this began, however, from a low starting point, and much more needs to be done.

Today the capacity of developing countries to grow is greater than it has ever been. The most important single accomplishment of the development effort over the past 20 years is that peoples throughout the developing world have acquired skills, adopted attitudes and built institutions that greatly increase their ability to use capital productively. Many developing countries are attaching greater importance to fiscal and monetary policies, and even to market incentives. It is slow, hard work, but many are building more adequate frameworks of administration. Investment and savings rates have moved upward. However, given the heavy expenditures on education—and in other sectors which give a return in increased production only after a long waiting period—it is hardly surprising that growth has been spectacular only in a few countries.

Despite many errors of commission and omission, despite the instability of political institutions, the growth potential is there. The developing countries are ready and able to continue progress at a faster rate.

On the side of the countries and institutions engaged in development assistance, experience has brought progress also. The quality of aid, while it still leaves much to be desired, has consistently improved; and the givers of aid have acquired growing understanding of the problems they face.

In the past two or three years, most of the aid-giving countries of the world have put their programs of development assistance under close examination. This scrutiny has resulted in a shift toward the greater use of international organizations, as one way of filtering some of the contradictions out of aid and of directing a larger flow of assistance to countries where economic performance justifies it. Since 1960, the participation of these multilateral organizations in the net transfer of financial resources to developing countries has increased threefold, although it still accounts only for a modest fraction of the total.

Development functions are being more effectively carried out, either by the established multilateral agencies or by new regional organizations which have been created. New combinations of bilateral and multilateral assistance are being worked out, to such an extent that in the next fiscal year, an estimated 85 per cent of United States aid, for instance, will be given either through multilateral channels or as part of a multinational effort coordinated by international agencies.

The World Bank group of institutions is in the mainstream of these developments. This Group, as most of you know, is a cluster of three institutions. At the center is the Bank itself. It is the world bank—the only thing of its kind. Our member, shareholder governments are spread over the world; our financial resources come from all over the world; we finance projects in all quarters of the world; our Executive Directors, officers and staff are from all parts of the world. No other institution or government department has the experience of the World Bank—the concentration of expertise and know-how embodied in our international staff, chosen and retained strictly on professional merit.

The Bank is now 21 years old, and has lent some \$10 billion, mostly in developing countries. Its loans are long term, at more or less conventional rates of interest, for projects of

high economic priority. About a third of its lending has been for electric power development, a third for the development of transportation, and the rest for agriculture, industry and education.

Flanking the Bank on one side is the International Development Association, engaged in the same kind of business, but on much easier conditions of repayment. IDA, as we call the Association for short, lends to the poorest countries in the Bank's membership—those not able to borrow and service on conventional terms all the capital they can effectively use for development. So far, most of its financing has been done in Asia; and more than 70 per cent of its \$1.6 billion of commitments have been made there. The purposes of IDA's lending reflect some of the most pressing problems of these client countries: the Association has been particularly active in financing agricultural and education projects.

Flanking the Bank on the other side is its other affiliate, the International Finance Corporation, or IFC. IFC works exclusively in the private sector. It does several things the Bank does not do: it makes loans to private borrowers without government guarantee; it invests in share capital; and it underwrites offerings or placements of securities by new or expanding enterprises. IFC operates in countries with a reasonably high level of savings and entrepreneurship; and more than half its \$200 million of commitments are for enterprises in Latin America.

The operations of the three institutions, although each has its own separate financial assets, are closely integrated. This year, I expect that they will disburse well over a billion dollars on their loans and investments, mostly for projects in the developing countries.

Many of the founding fathers of the Bank have had the opportunity of seeing their child grow up; otherwise they would not know their offspring today. Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then the American Under Secretary of State, expected in 1945 that the World Bank would be a quite limited enterprise. He explained to a Congressional committee: "In the normal case, a country will borrow from private bankers; but where private banks, because of the risk, cannot make the loan on terms which are possible for the borrower, both the borrower and banker may need the assistance of the . . . Bank. The Bank's function will be to investigate the soundness of the projects for which capital is desired, and if it agrees they are sound, it will guarantee the loans made by private banks." In fact, of course, this never happened; the Bank, under the successive presidencies of Eugene Meyer, John McCloy and particularly Eugene Black, became a borrower and a lender on its own account.

While they may not have been good forecasters, the founders nevertheless gave the Bank a priceless gift in the form of an extraordinary charter, called the Articles of Agreement. This charter endowed the Bank with three faculties.

First, it gave the Bank an aptitude for cooperation. In fact, the Bank is a true cooperative, deriving its resources from its members and using these resources for their benefit. Its member governments are not only its principal debtors, but also its shareholders and large creditors.

Second, the Bank was given the opportunity to be independent. It was not to rely solely on paid-in capital from governments; in addition, it was enabled to provide the larger part of its resources by borrowing in the world's capital markets. It was cast in corporate form, and was given the capacity to earn a profit and become self-supporting.

Third, the Bank was given a fundamental policy. It was commanded to base its operations on economic factors, and to stay out of politics. The Bank was thereby given a

hunger for facts, and a desire to develop the expertness needed to understand and interpret the facts.

All three of these faculties converged on one objective: the economic growth of the Bank's member countries.

The Bank did not learn to exercise these faculties all at once. As far as cooperation is concerned, some member countries, including Cuba under Castro and Indonesia under Sukarno, decided that the Bank was not the kind of cooperative they wanted to belong to, and they left—although Indonesia has now come back. In dealing with its borrowing shareholders, the Bank has moved carefully from problem to specific problem, elaborating its own policies and marking out its own trails. The Bank has worked hard during nearly all its twenty years to establish and maintain its high standing in the money markets of western Europe, Canada and the United States.

The instrument the Bank was given for dealing with its member countries was capital. This capital, to use the words of the charter, was to be applied to "projects, large and small alike." But one of the first things the Bank found out was that many of its clients did not know how to prepare projects. We had proposals, to mention a few, for dams that would be starved for water, for electric power systems that would lack customers, and for highways that would not fit local traffic and terrain.

In these circumstances, it seemed plain that if the Bank were to help finance any considerable number of projects, it would have to offer advice about how to prepare them as well. The Bank therefore not only closely examined proposals through studies of documents and visits to the field; as co-operator and expert, it also developed the practice of suggesting modifications or further study whenever necessary. It quickly found itself playing—and has since continued to play—an advisory role of considerable scope and variety, concerned with economics, engineering, administration and other factors bearing on project execution. We discuss with the borrower what kinds of technical services are needed, we advise on how best to obtain these services and, if necessary, we draw up terms of reference for the consultants.

For countries least able technically to prepare projects and least able to bring in the necessary outside help, we bear some of the cost; and we organize and supervise similar project studies financed by the United Nations Development Programme. We have also established cooperative programs whereby the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization work with us and our member countries to identify and prepare projects in agriculture and education. To help meet the especially urgent needs of African countries, we have established in that continent two regional offices of our own to work directly with local authorities in preparing agricultural and transportation projects.

At about the same time the Bank was discovering that projects often were inadequately studied, we were also finding out that they were planned without sufficient regard for their setting in the economy as a whole. We early concluded that any developing country would benefit from having some kind of program as a framework for development, relating projects to each other, taking account of the availability of financial resources, and giving thought to policy and administrative measures as well as to physical projects that would accelerate economic development. We have therefore developed a practice of organizing expert missions to visit individual countries and to draw up comprehensive recommendations that serve as a basis for working out a detailed development program.

The long range solution to the need for economic expertise, however, is for the developing countries to produce their own experts. The Bank has tried to help them do so by establishing an Economic Development Institute for the training of senior officials concerned with economic affairs. The Institute was set up as a sort of staff college where these officials could come together for periods ranging from three to six months, to study, to read, and to discuss practical development problems among themselves and with the best experts available from the Bank and elsewhere. The Institute began its work in 1956, and 700 officials have been through it. Many have advanced to posts of critical responsibility.

What we want, in a word, is to encourage constantly improving economic performance by our developing member countries. Not every country can have, or even profit from, a detailed development program, but every country can aspire to have a well-thought out set of policies which will provide the conditions and motivations conducive to economic growth. This is more and more what we find ourselves talking about with our member countries—fundamental policies to govern their day-to-day economic decisions. We are able to talk about policies and policy changes not as interlopers but as collaborators—and sometimes we give agreed policies the final measure of support they need to tip the scales in their favor in the councils of government.

In the Bank, we sometimes sum up our interests by saying, "The country is the project." That being so, we take an interest in the total assistance effort, including what others are doing to assist development in the country. In pursuit of this total view, we are helping to conduct an experiment intended to lead to a better coordination and use of external resources. This experiment brings together groups of countries and institutions, engaged in one form or another of development finance, for the purpose of considering jointly all the major problems in providing effective development assistance for particular recipient countries.

So far there are coordinating groups of this kind for 13 recipients, and in the next few days, we expect to be establishing a group for a fourteenth. The Bank is organizer and Chairman of ten of them, soon to be 11. As Chairman, the Bank assumes several responsibilities: It periodically makes comprehensive reports on the country's development possibilities and progress. It helps the developing country to identify and prepare projects, or to obtain the necessary technical assistance for doing so. It helps the government to devise a development program, and advises on problems of carrying out this program if it is asked to do so. It makes recommendations to the recipient government and to the members of the consultative group about the sectors and projects that seem to deserve priority in financing, and on the economic policies needed to achieve agreed development objectives.

Finally, the Bank comments on the country's estimates of aid requirements, making recommendations about the amount, types and terms of aid that are appropriate. The consultative group, nevertheless, is an example of what Dag Hammarskjöld used to call "freedom in unity," because actual aid commitments by members of a consultative group are arranged directly between a donor and the recipient.

While the consultative groups are a relatively new form of aid coordination, they already clearly demonstrate some superiority over uncoordinated bilateral aid. The coordinating group gains from the services of the Bank as honest broker and expert advisers, providing a realistic assessment of the recipient country's prospects and performance, offering a guide for the amount and kind of

assistance the donor countries might render, and—by carrying the main burden of collecting data—saving both rich and poor countries much duplication or repetition of effort. Above all, the process of consultation can effectively mesh external and internal resources, and can enable donor countries and the recipient to move in consistent ways toward the same development targets. I believe this is bound to lead to a decisive improvement in the quality both of external assistance and of economic performance by developing countries themselves. Coordinating groups with which the Bank is associated are now concerned with about half of all development assistance from official sources.

One would suppose as the performance of developing countries goes on improving, and as the techniques for development assistance become demonstrably more effective, that the support of industrialized countries for international development would increase. In fact, this is not happening.

Most of the financing of development—about three-quarters of it in fact—comes from the developing countries themselves, and it is right and proper for them to be carrying the main responsibility for investing in their own future. But the industrial countries are not doing enough to enable the less developed nations to earn their own way. The export earnings of the developing countries are not keeping up with the general growth of world trade, and formidable barriers in the form of tariffs, quotas and other kinds of hurdles stand in the way of their achieving a higher share of this trade. The effective tariffs on imports from developing countries are commonly from 20 to 40 per cent—a high margin in any case, but extremely so since this protection is being afforded to mature economies from economies which in many cases are still in their infant years.

The seriousness of these barriers can be seen from the fact that only six developing countries have markets larger in monetary terms than the State of Connecticut. Almost 100 developing countries have populations of less than 15 million, and of these, two-thirds have less than five million. These small markets effectively limit the possibility of development based on production for the local market, yet up to now this has been the most common policy aim, and I think the resource growth of both developed and underdeveloped countries has suffered as a result.

Not only is the trade potential of less developed countries being frustrated but the amount of development finance flowing to these countries is considerably less than they could effectively employ; and it is considerably less than the industrialized countries could reasonably afford—even by their own standards of what is an appropriate basis for sharing a small part of their increasing wealth with the poor countries.

Six years ago, the official net flow of financial resources from the industrialized countries reached a level of about \$6 billion a year. Today, after five years of unprecedented prosperity in the donor countries, the figure is about the same. Of the \$200 billion by which the production of the industrialized countries has grown in that interval, none has been put at the disposal of the developing countries through programs of assistance.

At a time when we should be making full speed ahead, development assistance is in the doldrums. There is discouragement that after 20 years of promise and exhortation, most of the world's poor are only a little less poor. There is widespread skepticism about the self-advantage to be had from aid; and there is a general tendency to greatly underestimate the ability and capacity of the developed to help the underdeveloped world. In truth, finance for development abroad has no constituency to influence the executive and legislative branches of governments.

Nevertheless, it is a happy and fortuitous circumstance that humans are humanitarian. As Adam Smith said, "How selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it. Of this kind is . . . compassion, the emotion which we feel for the misery of others, when we either see it, or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner . . ."

But there are other strong motives for helping less developed nations: the knowledge that more production in all developing countries will mean more trade for everyone; the hope that to make aid more effective now will more quickly bring the necessity for it to an end; above all, the trust that in the long run, rising income in developing countries may provide more room for the orderly evolution of their political institutions and make more likely the emergence of some sort of stable international order. "The new name for peace is development."

There is no danger that development assistance programs will be abandoned. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the industrialized countries will do enough, do it in the right way, and do it in time.

If the momentum of economic growth in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America is not speeded up, if leaders in these regions lose heart, then the prospect is for a rapid deterioration in world affairs that will inevitably become a matter of the highest concern in the United States and other industrial countries. Twenty years ago, when the crisis was faced in Europe, objectives were jointly defined and plans were jointly made to achieve them. In the case of the crisis in the developing world, no common plan has yet been formulated.

What is now necessary, it seems clear, is that industrialized countries should give joint consideration at the highest level to their policies of development finance. After 20 years of experience—and this includes many frustrations—the time has come, for a thorough examination of the objectives they are trying to achieve in their relationships with the developing world, of the importance of those objectives to their own national interests, and of the adequacy of the resources, the mechanisms and the techniques which are being employed to attain those objectives.

The kind of examination I have in mind would engage cabinet ministers concerned with foreign policy and finance as well as those more directly concerned with assistance programs. It would seek to move the worldwide aid effort from its somewhat tenuous and uncertain posture to a well thought-out and agreed-upon place in the whole scheme of international affairs.

Since the beginnings of that effort, science, technology and the means of creating material prosperity have advanced at a rate unprecedented in history. We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the riches of the world, to help many millions to escape hunger and to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time. What is needed now are firm political decisions to carry out an intensive, sustained and coordinated attack on underdevelopment, together with the political will and stamina to stay the course.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LVII

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in our conscription policies, Congress has always provided an accommodation for the objector whose opposition to war derives from religious beliefs. The present Universal Military Training and Service Act provides exemption from military service for any person "who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code."

Conscientious objectors represent one of the smallest groups in the Selective Service System. At the present moment, there are somewhat more than 3,300 of these young men, and most of these are performing their noncombatant services in civilian hospitals. Despite the meaningful work that they are doing, General Hershey is conscious of the extra administrative costs caused by these objectors.

The CO per individual will be more expensive to us than anything else we do—

Says General Hershey.

And maybe it is not worth it, but as long as we are a rich country I think that we can give some consideration. I tell my friends—and I have a great many of them who are conscientious objectors—that they are a luxury, and if we ever get in the lifeboat where everybody has to pull an oar, they will have to pull an oar or we will have to throw them overboard.

Congress has never recognized and has regularly rejected the claim for exemption of the objector whose conscience forbids him to participate in war, but who cannot assert any religious basis for his opposition to military service.

In 1965, however, the Supreme Court, in the United States against Seeger, interpreted the definition of "religious" broadly enough to embrace those moral pacifists who, though not affirming belief in a deity, hold a belief which takes the place in their lives that a belief in a Supreme Being takes in the life of a more conventionally religious person. Justice Clark said:

The test of belief in a relation to a Supreme Being is whether a given belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption. Where such beliefs have parallel positions in the lives of their respective holders we cannot say that one is "in relation to a Supreme Being" and the other is not.

Justice Clark held that the local draft boards "are not free to reject beliefs because they consider them incomprehensible. Their task is to decide whether the beliefs professed by a registrant are sincerely held and in his own scheme of things, religious." General Hershey, however, is unmoved by such statements and bolsters his views by referring to the fact that "Congress told me they did

not want philosophy, or economy, or sociology, or something else, they wanted religion."

It is my opinion, however, that the present statutory requirement in the draft law should be broadened so as to give equal consideration to the dictates of human conscience. I would call to the attention of my colleagues a policy statement issued by the general board of the National Council of Churches:

The highest interests of a free society are served by giving to conscience the greatest freedom consonant with a justice, public order, and safety. Although we may have created confidence in a conscience that is rooted in a religious tradition, we believe that ways and means should be provided so that the validity or sincerity of another's conscience may be recognized. Even though the majority may consider decision based on such a conscience to be mistaken in a particular instance, or may be uncertain of its sincerity in another, our nation shall protect the right of conscience in such cases for the sake of a greater good. Coercion of conscience can recruit no more than an unwilling body, while mind and spirit and a willing body are likely to serve society more fully in alternative tasks not repugnant to conscience. Therefore we urge the greatest possible respect for conscience and the greatest possible protection for its free exercise.

If the religious objector exemption figures can be used as a guide, then the numbers who would object to all wars on moral grounds would be insignificant. Furthermore, the sincerity of an individual who requested such an exemption from military service would be very carefully scrutinized, probably more so than the appeal of a religious objector. The opposition to war because of moral reasons should be respected. I do not, however, support selective objection to war. Moral opposition to war means a revulsion against war under all, and not just some, circumstances. I do not believe that one can pick and choose which wars to fight and which ones to sit out.

THE 176TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to direct the attention of the House to the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution which was adopted on the 3d day of May 1791, and which provided the people of Poland with their greatest thrust toward freedom. This Constitution, which was adopted just 2 years after our American Constitution, resulted from the same spirit of freedom which swept the world at the moment when our own Nation was born. This desire for liberty was a "shared" experience throughout the world.

The adoption of the Polish Constitution did not insure the freedom which it promised. Geography and the circumstances of history have not been kind to the freedom-loving spirit of the Polish people.

Today, in spite of the forces of restraint which endeavor to suppress, the people of Poland have courageously made clear their right to the freedom of worship and the human dignity which it motivates. They have insisted on these rights in the face of government protests and restrictions. In Poland, the light of freedom has not been extinguished and will not be put out so long as this spirit continues.

Polish Americans throughout the United States have distinguished themselves as defenders of the American Constitution, defenders of liberty and the highest American traditions. From their heritage, they have developed a real appreciation of the significance of liberty and free institutions.

As Americans, we must renew our hope that our concepts of freedom and liberty will be extended to the Polish people.

COMPREHENSIVE STATE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs the Nation has faced during recent years of economic, social, and technological change, has been the need for more comprehensive planning by State educational agencies.

Where States had the initiative and the desire to engage in such long-range planning, they often lacked the financial resources to do so. That is why the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is so valuable for the States, and why the act must be continued and expanded.

Title V of the act has provided State educational agencies with necessary financial assistance to develop, organize, and implement a variety of programs designed to strengthen their capacity for educational leadership and technical assistance.

One of the ways a State department of education could assert such leadership is in the development of a comprehensive educational planning program. But as a result of the heavy burdens already carried by many States, they have been unable to mount as effective a statewide educational planning program as they deem desirable. To overcome these difficulties, H.R. 7819 creates a new part B to title V earmarking funds for comprehensive educational planning.

Systematic educational planning must be encouraged if State departments of education are to utilize effectively all available resources and strengthen and improve education at all levels of government.

State education agencies should be responsible for developing statewide education goals, the analysis of these goals in terms of resources, establishment of priorities among goals, ways and means

of achieving them, and the evaluation of the entire process from goals to achievement. The bill presently under consideration would provide Federal assistance for precisely such activities.

Title V-B, as set forth in H.R. 7819, would establish in State education agencies a program of comprehensive educational planning for elementary and secondary education. If a State wishes to include higher education in its program of long-range planning, it may do so. Either the State department of education or a coordinate higher education planning agency may undertake the function.

Seventy-five percent of the funds authorized for this provision will be allotted among the States according to the following formula: 40 percent would be allotted equally among the States; 60 percent would be allotted on the basis of the State's population. The remaining 25 percent of the authorization would be reserved to the Commissioner of Education for special project grants and contracts which might be of a multistate or regional nature.

H.R. 7819 provides for a total authorization for title V of \$65 million for fiscal year 1968 and \$80 million for fiscal year 1969. Of this sum, 70 percent would be spent for programs designed to strengthen State educational agencies—the present title V—and 30 percent would be available to the State educational agencies for comprehensive educational planning.

I do not believe anyone in this Chamber will dispute the value of prior planning in assuring the wisest possible use of funds for education. H.R. 7819 provides the vehicle for assuring that our States are able to plan, by making Federal assistance available to them for such a purpose. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to title V.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today the people of Poland adopted a constitution which to this day is a model of democracy and liberalism. Like our own, which was adopted just 2 years before, the document draws its strength from a basic belief in the people. The Polish Constitution states simply:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

However, such thoughts in 1791 were dangerous ones in Europe and less than 4 years later Poland was overrun and partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. Liberalism, as embodied in the Polish Constitution, was not to be toler-

ated by the rulers of 18th-century Europe.

And once again we see this spirit of freedom and liberalism that is Poland held in check. Today as Poles the world over celebrate their Constitution Day, there will be no such celebrations in Poland. It is a silent holiday in Poland because just as 18th-century Russia, Prussia, and Austria could not abide the ideals expressed in the Polish Constitution, so today's Communist regime is obligated to try to stamp out these same ideals if it is to survive. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, it will not survive. People, nations, even continents may be held in captivity for periods of time, but, eventually, the will to be free will not be denied. Poland will be free again just as she has before regained her freedom from would-be conquerors. The Polish people still fight for their freedom, as they always have, and always will. Though harassed by their unwanted leaders, the Polish people maintain their dedication to their Christian heritage of freedom and equality as they so well demonstrated during last year's observance of the Polish millennium. Despite official threats and interference, Poles by the hundreds of thousands publicly demonstrated their steadfast faith to the principles which marked the first thousand years of that nation's Christianity.

Mr. Speaker, Poland needs our support and the Polish people need our encouragement and help as they struggle to rid themselves of the foul weight of atheistic communism. And as we salute those gallant people we must also salute their friends and relatives here who make up the many loyal Polish-American societies. Their work means much to their loved ones in Poland just as it adds to the finer traditions of this country.

CONDUCT OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, certain Members of Congress have made impassioned speeches deploring the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

I had hoped that they would be more temperate in the way they escalated their opposition to the administration's policies. Surely to say that we are engaged in "a policy of madness" borders on the irresponsible.

I do not believe that it is "madness" to bomb military installations and strategic targets belonging to the enemy in time of war.

I do not believe that it is "madness" to disrupt the flow of men and materials that resupply enemy forces engaged in ground action with American and South Vietnamese troops.

What would be "madness" in my view is to allow enemy military power to func-

tion unimpeded and unchecked at the source of its power.

I believe that no American President—and certainly not President Johnson—has wanted to involve the Nation in war.

There is no greater burden to a President than ordering young Americans into battle. There is no greater anxiety facing a President than the possibility of involving America in a costly and bloody war.

We did not start this war nor did we seek involvement in it. Our involvement occurred because, as the leading power of the free world, we simply could not remain indifferent to the fate of others who asked for our help and support.

And the people of South Vietnam sought America's help and support.

President Johnson is ahead of everyone else in wanting to find peace in Vietnam. But he also must persist in the struggle until the possibilities of negotiations are realized.

To date, there have been 12 separate peace initiatives from the United States to Hanoi. And all of them have been curtly rejected.

We know from the exchange of correspondence between President Johnson and Ho Chi Minh, made public recently by Hanoi, that it is not the United States which seeks to prolong the war.

As far as I know, Ho Chi Minh's position is still the same.

He demands a halt to the bombing.

He demands a complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces in South Vietnam.

He demands American recognition of the Communist Liberation Front.

If these harsh demands are met—and if bombing against the north were completely halted—talks could begin. In other words, if the United States completely withdraws from Vietnam and initiates a total cease-fire on land and in the air, then the possibility of talks could be said to exist.

This, I submit, is truly a policy of madness.

There can no longer be the slightest doubt about who wants peace and who wants the war to continue.

For his part, President Johnson has emphasized our Nation's determination to continue to press for negotiations. We will not be discouraged; nor will we be deterred from this quest to find a formula that will bring Hanoi to its senses and to the negotiating table.

The onus for peace rests squarely with Hanoi. The world is watching and waiting for a reasonable response.

Our President will continue to press the cause for peace through an honorable settlement of differences.

He will continue to insure a strong but measured U.S. military response to meet aggression.

And most important of all, he will continue to count upon the support and understanding of the American people during the difficult weeks and months ahead.

No impassioned speeches against this war—from whatever source—can negate one basic fact: We want peace. And our Government is led by men who have only one objective for Vietnam—a peaceful and honorable settlement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to insert in the RECORD a sampling of editorials regarding the eloquent speech made earlier by Gen. William C. Westmoreland. General Westmoreland put into perspective America's goals in Vietnam and what we must do to win the peace: [From the New York World Journal Tribune, Apr. 25, 1967]

THE MAN WHO KNOWS

An eloquent answer was delivered by Gen. William C. Westmoreland to the Kings and the Carmichaels, the Fulbrights and the fulminators, the Spocks and the sheep, the marchers and the well-meaning about what is going on in Viet Nam, and why.

Gen. Westmoreland, more than any other person, knows—for he has been the commander of U.S. forces there for more than three years—and his talk before the nation's newspaper editors and publishers was a lesson in compassion as well as national purpose.

Our side, Gen. Westmoreland said, is "involved in a total undertaking—a single, all-pervading confrontation in which the fate of the people of Viet Nam, the independence of the free nations of Asia and the future of emerging nations, as well as the reputation and very honor of our country, are at stake."

That says it.

Gen. Westmoreland spiked some of the myths:

Cease-fires: "In this war, inevitably it will be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side."

Bombing of civilians: "Never in the history of warfare have so many precautions been taken by men in combat."

Speaking of war against civilians, Gen. Westmoreland said that "during the last nine years, 53,000 Vietnamese—a large share of them teachers, policemen and elected or natural leaders—have been killed or kidnapped. Translated to the United States, that would be more than 600,000 people..."

Of terrorism, the man who knows cited "a typical example":

"During the early morning hours of April 16, the Viet Cong attacked a hamlet 20 miles north of Saigon. Among the victims were five revolutionary development team members. Three of them were women. Their hands were tied behind their backs and they were shot through the head."

Enough to persuade the stop-the-bombing crowd, the draft card burners and the peace-niks? If not, perhaps Gen. Westmoreland's allusion to "recent unpatriotic acts at home" will.

The enemy, he said "sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve" and, "encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Viet Nam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north"—which "inevitably will cost lives."

The general's appeal to the national will was as incisive as the words of any editorial:

"The magnificent men and women I command in Viet Nam have earned the unified support of the American people."

They have indeed.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S APPEAL

In his address to the Associated Press managing editors, General Westmoreland was calling for two things—understanding of the war in Vietnam and support on the home front. It was an admirable performance, one which should inspire confidence in the man who is responsible for the direction in combat of some 435,000 Americans.

This general is not a wishful thinker. "The end," he said, "is not in sight. I foresee, in the months ahead, some of the bitterest fighting of the war."

But General Westmoreland also spoke with confidence in our "battlefield capability." The problem as he sees it no longer involves danger of a military defeat. A military victory is beyond the reach of the Communists. He is concerned, however, with the attitude of some Americans.

"The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam," he said, "have earned the unified support of the American people." But a noisy minority denies them this unified support. And our troops "are dismayed, as I am, by recent unpatriotic acts here at home. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

General Westmoreland knows, of course, that it is impossible to ban anti-war demonstrations in this country. Even as he spoke to the editors, demonstrators were marching in front of the hotel, one of them carrying a placard which read: "Westmoreland Wanted for War Crimes."

What can be done, however, and what General Westmoreland evidently hoped to do, is to isolate the peaceniks by appealing to the patriotism and the good sense of the American people.

The same thing is true of the address to the Economics Club of Detroit by General Wallace M. Greene Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps.

A great many, perhaps most, Americans are uneasy and unhappy with the war in Vietnam. But they also know that there is no easy way out. And as they come to realize that such shameful episodes as the recent demonstrations in New York and San Francisco serve no better purpose than to encourage the enemy and prolong the war, we think they will listen to the General Westmorelands and the General Greenes, not to the shrill, irrational clamor on the American Left.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S FRANK ADDRESS

(By DAVID LAWRENCE)

Someone in the administration certainly made a wise decision in letting Gen. William C. Westmoreland go before the managing editors of the Associated Press at their annual meeting in New York City this week and make such a frank and outspoken address about the Vietnam war.

The only question that arises is why the things he said were not emphasized heretofore by the government of the United States, so that throughout the world it would become known that the protesting groups in this country do not reflect public opinion.

The United States military commander in Vietnam said pointedly that he saw signs of "enemy success in the world arena" which could not be matched on the battlefield. The general stated the case succinctly when he added:

"He (the enemy) does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

For several months now, inside and outside of Congress, criticism of the Vietnam war not only has been disheartening, but has actually played a part in prolonging the conflict and preventing peace negotiations. Scarcely a day passes that some senator doesn't arise to announce that the war is being "escalated" or that America has no business fighting for freedom any more. The impression conveyed is that, when the United States is engaged in a war, it must ask the

members of the Senate just what tactics to employ. This not only damages morale but causes confusion in the handling of the war strategy itself.

Whenever the American forces intensify their attack, there is an outcry in congress. Thus, on the same day that Westmoreland was making his speech in New York, the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mike Mansfield, said that the American air strikes against the MIG bases in North Vietnam represent "further escalation" which, he declared, "will make it more difficult to get negotiations under way."

Another Democratic leader—Vice President Hubert Humphrey—almost coincidentally was telling the Texas state legislature at Austin that it would be "A betrayal of American liberalism" for this country to forsake the rest of the world and fail to use America's strength to preserve freedom. He declared:

"What would be the morality of a nation which devoted its riches only to itself, or regarded freedom in one part of the world as less precious than in another?"

Neither political party has been able to give the President the solid support which the commander-in-chief has always had in past wars in American history.

The Vietnam war is being pursued on the battlefield and in the air more effectively today than ever before. But unity at home is essential to the success of the military policy.

Although the United Nations seems frustrated, individual governments can still perform a useful function in expressing themselves frankly in support of the American position.

In the next few months, world opinion could force the North Vietnamese to the conference table and bring an end to the war. This is not likely, however, as long as there are staged protests as well as criticisms in Congress which indicate that either the United States is afraid of the enemy and will not use its maximum power, or that an artificially developed fear of "escalation" will cause the American government to retreat and eventually withdraw in humiliation.

President Johnson is known to have taken a positive position—namely, that he will follow the advice of the military men and pursue the war vigorously in order to persuade the enemy that it is better for the aggressors to withdraw now from South Vietnam and save themselves from a destructive punishment.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Apr. 25, 1967]

GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S BLUNT TALK

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of the U.S. forces in Vietnam, foresees some of the bitterest fighting of the war in the months ahead. And in his speech to the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York, he was unusually frank in pinpointing where he thinks much responsibility for this lies.

The enemy, he said, "does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the North. This inevitably will cost lives—American, Vietnamese and those of our other brave allies."

This is a blunt statement that many will find hard to swallow; nevertheless it puts before the American people in specific form a dilemma of democracy. General Westmoreland did not suggest that debate be curbed, but he expressed his dismay, and that of the men doing the fighting, over "recent unpatriotic acts here at home."

It has long been apparent that Hanoi sees in the protest movements in this country

confirmation of its preconceived idea that eventually the United States will simply pull out.

It may well be that the country will tire, but it is a tragic miscalculation to assume that this will lead to withdrawal pure and simple. What Hanoi should be considering is that the impatience might lead to unleashing of this country's power, which has been held back with remarkable restraint.

This is the dangerous factor that could result in a widening of the war beyond Vietnam with catastrophic consequences. It is far from a remote possibility, and it ought to be seriously pondered by those in this country who exercise their right of protest, as well as by Hanoi.

QUIE SUBSTITUTE WOULD TAKE CONGRESS OUT OF THE EDUCATION BUSINESS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the true ironies of the Quie substitute for the elementary and secondary education amendments is the apparent willingness of its supporting Members to surrender all congressional control—save that of the purse strings—over Federal aid to education. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] would be unwilling to take this step for farmers, for postal clerks, for veterans.

He would tell the American taxpayer that Congress is willing to turn over \$3 billion a year of his money to State and local agencies with no congressional controls whatsoever. We would not know whether the funds were spent wisely or poorly. We would not know whether we were doing our job properly or not.

Now, I am in favor of local control of education. Power to make educational decisions has rested at that level, and should continue to do so. But we have a national interest in improving the capacities of our young people, and the Congress is responsible for legislating in the national interest.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the national interest is best served by Congress if it retains the power to set priorities in the use of Federal aid and to make sure that national needs are being met. This is the approach we took with the National Defense Education Act—now almost 10 years old and flourishing. And this is the approach we took in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

There is no question that, in addition to the categories the Congress establishes as national priorities, there may be a need to provide supplementary tax support for State and local efforts in education. But Mr. QUIE's proposal would not do this. It would retain all the categories set up under Elementary Secondary Education Act and National Defense Education Act. At the same time, however, it would surrender our congressional prerogative to expand public funds for top-level Federal priorities.

This approach may make our job easier, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what we are here for. It would be a sorry day, indeed, if every time the Congress were faced with a national problem, it virtually turned its back on it. What the Republican substitute does in effect is say to the American public: "Okay, we'll provide the money, but we want no part of the problem. You work it out, and we'll pay your bills."

Mr. Speaker, this is a power we would not give our wives. It is not legislating; it is abdicating.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, an uncountable number of deaths and injuries of our schoolchildren at road crossings are prevented every year by a well-organized and dedicated group of young people protecting each other as school safety patrols. These children who rise early in all kinds of weather to police dangerous corners, preventing their classmates from darting in front of cars rushing to and from work, provide an invaluable but unsung service to the entire community. By endorsing the second week in May as National School Safety Patrol Week as I propose in the bill I am introducing today, we can give these exemplary young people the recognition they richly deserve and inspire them to make their organization even more effective.

GREATEST CHALLENGE FACING THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE TODAY IS THE CONCEPT OF CONTAINERIZATION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the greatest challenge facing the American merchant marine today is the concept of containerization. It affects every phase of the shipping operation from the banker who finances export transactions to the longshoremen on the piers. Hitherto, ocean transportation has started at the shoreline. As containerization develops, the ocean transportation will be moved backward until it originates at the shipper's place of business and terminates at the receiver's.

The concept of financing ocean shipments by means of the bill of lading will require extreme modification because it is likely in the future that the bill of lading will be so changed that it will

be useless as a commercial document for financial purposes. The customs system will require modification since it will necessitate the presence of customs officials at the place of original loading and final discharge of the container, and the ship will be merely one element in the overall transportation system. The longshoremen will be relegated to the job of attaching clips to containers and will have no other or further duties. While this will unquestionably relieve the heavy physical burden upon these men, we must face the facts—it will require far fewer numbers of them.

As for the ports, those who hesitate in providing space and equipment to handle increasing numbers of containers will find themselves in the back waters of commerce. This will require very substantial investments even in the best of our ports and it is important that the appropriate port authorities recognize this fact so that they can take advantage of the new technology. In some cases it will require radical relocation of port facilities so that they can be integrated with trucking lines and railroads to permit the unimpeded flow of containers. As far as the ship operators themselves are concerned, many problems remain to be solved. Among those in the North Atlantic for example, there are some 10 new vessels which will be placed in service in the course of the next year or so. In view of the far higher productivity of these vessels, both by reason of their larger size and higher speed and faster turn around, it is probable that this route will be overtonnaged for the next few years.

It may well be that the new port facilities required will be in advance of requirement, but it is essential that the facilities both by way of ships and port facilities be provided so that maximum advantage can be taken of the new system.

We in the Philadelphia area are particularly fortunate by reason of our geographical location and land transportation facilities to be in a position to make maximum use of the new concept. However, we must not hesitate to devote the necessary thought and capital to keep ahead of developments. In the light of expansion of this concept, it may well be that the entire future of our port is dependent upon proper development in this direction.

I am particularly conscious of this problem both as a representative of our great port and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. I have actually observed the major developments in other areas, and I am fully convinced of the necessity of expansion of facilities in our port. While I recognize that the merchant marine has many other problems, notably lack of replacement of ships, I feel that from our own selfish viewpoint this must be our major consideration.

MODEL CITIES BILL OFFERS HOPE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important byproducts of the President's model cities program is the encouragement and hope it has offered to cities and to the mayors all across the Nation.

This hope and encouragement was so eloquently expressed in a recent article by Mayor John F. Collins, of Boston. In speaking of the President's model cities program, he said:

It provides all of society, not merely the cities and their residents, with the opportunity to demonstrate that we have the knowledge, the capacity and the will to improve substantially the quality of urban life.

He continued to say that:

The most demanding challenge which Model Cities places before our cities is that they demonstrate the capacity to manage and organize their resources, and the capability to alter existing organizations or to help create new organizations which can effectively deal with technology and change.

Mayor Collins is a man who is intimately involved in trying to solve the problems of urban blight. He is not sitting on the sidelines just dreaming what should be done. He is working to see that it is done. I urge that we listen to what he has to say.

Mayor Collins' article, appearing in the April 23 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe, presents one of the more persuasive arguments to why Congress should appropriate the full \$412 million requested by the President.

Therefore, I would like to share this excellent article with my colleagues by including it at this point with my remarks:

MODEL CITIES BILL OFFERS HOPE

(By Mayor John F. Collins)

With the Model Cities legislation our cities have been asked to demonstrate that they have the purpose and the understanding to develop programs which will substantially improve the living environment and general welfare of people living in blighted neighborhoods.

The accomplishment of this task demands a comprehensive attack on social, economic, and physical problems through the effective and efficient allocation of all our resources, public and private.

It provides all of society, not merely the cities and their residents, with the opportunity to demonstrate that we have the knowledge, the capacity and the will to improve substantially the quality of urban life. Further, we must prove that we can efficiently manage change.

Manage change we must!—for only in this way can we do a far better job than we have in the past of assuring that the burdens of change, beneficial to society as a whole, are not borne disproportionately by a few individuals.

Despite our present efforts, the strength and vitality of our older cities continues to wane. Our older cities, in many instances, have been unable to compete with the attractive suburban green and the age of the motor car, although here in Boston the flight to the suburbs has at least been arrested.

Into our older cities come the new immigrant, the farmer, the Negro, the Puerto Rican, almost penniless, inexperienced and unknown. Today he is destined to live in slums or to generate new slums through simple

overcrowding. Here he finds himself unable to gain adequate employment. Here he must pay the price imposed by poverty, limited skills, ignorance and deprivation.

The passage of Model Cities legislation is itself an expression of our society's long delayed recognition that the persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of low-income families in our older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and public facilities have resulted in a marked deterioration in the living environment of large numbers of people.

The concern of Model Cities is not with what to do to improve urban life, for hopefully we have learned something in over 20 years battle with our environment but rather—how to do it.

The orientation of the program is prevention rather than cure. Our major emphasis must be towards preventing social problems from developing.

The most demanding challenge which Model Cities places before our cities is that they demonstrate the capacity to manage and organize their resources, and the capability to alter existing organizations or to help create new organizations which can effectively deal with technology and change.

Corporate institutions have demonstrated such a capacity. One reason is, perhaps, that they did not cling to erroneous ideas about themselves and their environment. They realized that progressive societies outgrow organizations as children outgrow clothing.

If the Model Cities program is to be successful our cities must begin to state their objectives by action. We must begin to engage in a continuing progress of decision-making concerning the nature of what is public responsibility and how we go about meeting that responsibility. Local leaders must take the initiative in experimenting with new ideas and patterns of government for meeting their needs.

If we are to improve substantially urban life, we need inventiveness in the democratic process. We need a fruitful combination of public and private initiative and the involvement of the neighborhood in their affairs at City Hall.

Each of us, public official, technologist, teacher, businessman, housewife, and citizen must demonstrate that we can deal effectively with the social and economic issues of today—that we can restore in the less fortunate a sense of purpose—that we can secure for our children, the jobless, the aged, the deprived, the fruits of a good life. We must liberate the poor from the chains of poverty and liberate the aging from the bonds of boredom, illness and idleness. Only in this way can we realize our dreams of great cities as the foundation for the Great Society.

Finally, and most important, if Model Cities are to succeed we must have as a minimum the \$412 million which the President of the United States has asked the Congress to appropriate this year. The Model Cities program, is also a recognition that cities do not have enough money themselves to even begin to undertake such ambitious programs. We have the purpose. The Congress must now make available the money.

STATE REPORT EVALUATES COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the status of the community action programs and their role in the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity is a subject of widespread interest.

For this reason I believe the information in the two following editorials, both taken from the Oklahoma Journal, Oklahoma City daily newspaper, are worthy of attention, and I therefore enter them herewith:

HOW THE WAR GOES ON POVERTY

Although there has been some disillusionment with the war on poverty in America, a recent report by the coordinator of the Division of Economic Opportunity in Oklahoma, Robert L. Haught, provides solid evidence that some important battles are being won. In Oklahoma, at least.

In his report to the Governor and to members of the Oklahoma Congressional delegation and the state legislature, Haught shows the scope of the Economic Opportunity Program to be a surprisingly large one, beginning with 10 basic programs and branching out into a number of lesser ones.

The Economic Opportunity coordinator confines himself to one segment of the overall program in his report called "Communities in Action," and concentrates on the program called "Community Action."

"Community Action," he reports, "has become a moving and vibrant force in Oklahoma in a relatively short span of time. In county after county over the state, citizens have banded together in a common effort to expand opportunities and bring about overall community improvement."

The Community Action program began in Oklahoma county in April of 1965 and spread to Pawnee county the following month. By the end of the year, a total of 23 counties were engaged in it.

During the first six months of 1966, Haught reports, the total rose to 54 counties with funded Community Action Agencies. Five more counties had submitted applications for funds and an additional five counties had formed Community Action organizations.

The funded CAAs include one which covers three counties and two which cover two counties each, for a total of 50 operating agencies. These 50 agencies are serving more than 90 per cent of the low-income population of the state. The remaining counties have access to individual programs like Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Adult Basic Education and Rural Loans.

Thousands of Oklahomans of all ages, with varying ethnic, cultural and economic backgrounds, have involved themselves in these local efforts to help low-income citizens help themselves.

Governing the activities of the 50 Community Action agencies are around 1,200 board members—local citizens who contribute their time and talents without compensation. Of the total, some 350 are representatives of the poor. About one-fourth of the board members come from minority groups.

LOCAL BUSINESSMEN HELP

Probably one of the best testimonials to the effectiveness of the Community Action program as one prong of the war on poverty, is supplied by an employee.

Among the CAA staffs are many from the low-income group who have become employed as directors, assistant directors, secretaries or neighborhood workers. One of these expresses what the program means in the following terms:

"In the time I have been in the CAP office, I have felt a deep feeling of accomplishment as I feel anyone must feel who works with impoverished people or with people who are striving together to help themselves and their neighbors. I know the feeling of going

to bed hungry and the embarrassment of going to school without a decent pair of shoes to wear. Because I have experienced the sufferings of the poor, I feel very deeply toward their problems.

"Also since being with Community Action I have found that the people in the big offices downtown have more feeling and desire toward the poorer class than I ever dreamed it was possible."

This is a heartening expression from one who deals closely with the program and it speaks well for the manner in which it is being operated.

The Division of Economic Opportunity is located in the Sequoyah Office Building across the street from the state capitol and persons who would like to learn more about its operations would do well to make application there.

BETTER POSTAL SYSTEM OVERDUE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in Perth Amboy, as in thousands of other communities across the Nation, Postmaster General O'Brien's plan to establish a nonprofit postal corporation has fallen on receptive ears. The Perth Amboy Evening News contends that Mr. O'Brien only said aloud what millions of Americans have known for some time: that the Post Office Department cannot continue to operate under its present system. An editorial in the Evening News of April 7, 1967, called for a study of Mr. O'Brien's recommendation and consideration of other alternatives, including turning the postal service over to private industry. I insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

BETTER POSTAL SYSTEM OVERDUE

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien has said out loud what millions of Americans have known for some time: The Post Office department cannot continue to operate under its present system.

To stress how outmoded the present arrangement is, O'Brien said that if the telephone system were operated the way the Post Office Department is, "the carrier pigeon business would still have a great future."

The comparison may seem funny, but the ills confronting the Post Office Department require a solution.

O'Brien's suggestion that it be replaced by a non-profit government corporation has considerable merit.

The government should also study the possibility of having the postal system operated by private enterprise with government supervision of rate schedules.

If the current debate over the Post Office Department involved a federally-operated telephone system, there probably would be some hesitation about turning the operation of the telephone system over to a private enterprise.

Private enterprise, however, does operate the telephone systems profitably, despite strict government supervision and regulation.

If private enterprise could provide the nation with a superior postal system, why should it not be permitted to start operations?

It would be unthinkable for the management of any large American corporation to

settle for anything less than the most efficient methods of operation possible. Yet, the nation has for years endured a postal system that costs more than ever and yields a minimum of services.

What the Post Office Department needs is a touch of corporate genius if it is ever to provide better postal service on a more stable monetary basis. The new system may require larger rate increases, but certainly the O'Brien plan should be studied.

To overcome what he called "a jungle of restrictive legislation and custom" now strangling the department, O'Brien urged that the non-profit corporation be operated by a board of managers appointed by the President and confirmed by Congress. At the head would be a professional executive.

Last week the House of Representatives cut \$100 million from the \$6.6 billion appropriation requested for the Post Office Department. This action, it was reported, may have prompted O'Brien to call for something better.

If the House decision produced the O'Brien recommendation, the congressmen who voted for the cut in appropriations may have done the American people a big favor.

The nation needs a vastly improved postal system to replace the battered one it now puts up with a staggering cost. The O'Brien plan deserves careful examination without delay.

QUIE SUBSTITUTE NOT GENERAL AID

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the irony of the substitute offered from the other side of the aisle is that, if anything, it is more restrictive, more categorical, and gives less freedom to the States and localities of the Nation than anything that has yet come to pass under the name of Federal aid to education.

In fact, the only real differences between it and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act titles it is supposed to replace are that it gives less money than the administration bill for the educationally disadvantaged children who need it most, and more authority—not less—to the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I am for general aid to education, not a categorical package. True and complete general aid would establish no categories. It would give every State total freedom to set its own priorities.

But the substitute bill which has been introduced would not provide this freedom.

On the contrary, the proposed substitute would continue all the categories now found in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, earmarking funds for certain types of programs. But these are small matters compared with the overwhelming power given the Commissioner of Education.

Who would approve how each State uses its funds? The Commissioner of Education.

Who would pass on whether the funds

are equitably distributed? The Commissioner.

Who would decide whether private schoolchildren are getting their fair share of programs? Again, the Commissioner of Education.

Under the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Commissioner's powers to monitor the great bulk of the funds are greatly limited. Title I is not a State plan program. All a State has to do is assure the Commissioner that funds will be used in accordance with the law. As far as distribution of funds go, it is the Congress which assures each school district its fair share.

Under the so-called general aid approach in the proposed substitute, however, the States would have to account to the Commissioner for how money would be spent.

The substitute measure is a bad version of what we have already got. Rather than taking us down a genuine general aid path, it hauls us back a few steps from where we already are.

Let us not kid ourselves about what we are being offered in the proposed substitute. The proposed substitute is not an unrestricted general aid bill.

For these and other reasons the proposed substitute should be rejected and the committee's bill supported.

COMMUNIST INVESTMENT IN MARTIN LUTHER KING IS PAYING OFF AGAIN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert here in the RECORD two items for the benefit of those who still do not want to believe, in spite of the record, that Martin Luther King has been prompted over the years by two driving forces, his own personal aggrandizement and his dedication to Communist goals. His lengthy record of "hit and run" in the agitation of Negro unrest has pretty well dispelled by now any belief that he acted in the civil rights movement out of unselfish motives. Looking back on his career as an agitator, it is now clear to see that his role consisted entirely of stirring up protests, grabbing headlines and television coverage, and moving on, having contributed nothing to the legitimate cause of the Negro; having driven wedges between the races that reasonable Negroes and whites have found difficult and sometimes impossible to mend.

Now that the civil rights movement has lost its glamor, his earlier training at such gatherings as the Communist Highlander Folk School has called him on to another field, to serve another Communist end, mobilizing support for Peking and Hanoi in their war against South Vietnam.

The first item I would like to include

is the Washington Post story on General Westmoreland's statement on April 24, that such protests as King is stirring up provides encouragement to the Communists in Vietnam and are paid for with the lives of American servicemen.

The second item is the Post's story on the plans King has developed to protest the U.S. war against the Communists.

The administration is, I am sure, appalled that King has turned against it after years of servility on their part, but it is no surprise to anyone who sees King for what he is. His hand-in-hand association with the convicted draft dodger and convicted homosexual Bayard Rustin should have indicated years ago his views on military service to the Nation.

Is all this coincidence? Reason and commonsense tell us not.

King's activities represent subversion and anarchy in the pristine sense of the words. I know that he will not be punished for what he has done and is doing in support of Communist ends for the simple reason that he is a Negro, but his pejorative behavior must be recorded, against the day when we are asked why we allowed this man to do what he has done.

The articles referred to follow:

WESTMORELAND SAYS PROTESTS ENCOURAGE ENEMY IN VIETNAM—NO EARLY END OF WAR SEEN BY COMMANDER

(By David S. Broder)

NEW YORK, April 24.—Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam, said today that anti-war protests in this country are encouraging the enemy and costing American lives.

Westmoreland told the annual meeting of the Associated Press that "only alternative to the war of attrition" now being waged in Vietnam "is a war of annihilation, and we have ruled that out."

"I do not see any end to the war in sight," the gray-haired, 53-year-old commander told a rapt audience of newspaper executives at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. "We are going to have to grind him [the enemy] down."

"But," he continued, "we are in a stronger position to win such a war than the enemy, so long as we retain our resolve."

Anti-war demonstrations in the United States, Westmoreland said, undercut the efforts of the troops and encourage the enemy to "hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily."

ADVANTAGE TO ENEMY

Westmoreland also said that any cease-fire before clear-cut victory is achieved would "inevitably be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side."

In a nationally televised address, the first since his return from the battlefield, the General warned that "the bitterest fighting of the war" may come in the months ahead. His tone throughout was somber. He explained why he thought the anti-war demonstrations were dangerous to the hopes of victory in these terms:

"The enemy does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeat but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the North."

"This inevitably will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies," the General said.

DEMONSTRATORS OUTSIDE

While he spoke, about 100 anti-war demonstrators marched and chanted outside. Police halted their attempt to burn an effigy of Westmoreland.

DR. KING ANNOUNCES BIG ANTIWAR DRIVE

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 23.—The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. announced today a "Vietnam Summer" drive "against the war and against U.S. interventions elsewhere."

The civil rights leader also said he will have an announcement within 24 hours as to his political plans. There have been reports he will run for President in 1968.

Dr. King also said he supports Americans who refuse to serve in the armed forces "including Muhammad Ali (Cassius Clay), the heavyweight champ who has vowed to go to jail rather than be inducted into the Army Friday."

Dr. King said the "Vietnam summer" drive will include anti-draft activities, sponsorship of peace candidates in local and state elections and referendums in municipal elections asking for an end to the war.

Dr. King called for 10,000 volunteers to spend the summer organizing peace movements in communities across the Nation. He said he expected to use a trained field staff of about 200 workers from the civil rights and peace movement.

"We throughout the nation who oppose this war must reach others who are concerned," Dr. King said. "It is time to move from demonstrations and university teach-ins to a nationwide community teach-out."

Dr. King was joined at a news conference by pediatrician Dr. Benjamin Spock and Robert Scheer, editor of Ramparts Magazine, in calling for a "Vietnam Summer" that would use techniques of the civil rights movement to apply pressure upon the Johnson Administration to end the Vietnam War.

A pamphlet distributed at the conference said the long-range aim of the organizing effort is creation of a vocal, strong anti-war bloc by 1968.

"We aim at more than changing a vote or two in Congress," the pamphlet said. "We seek to defeat Lyndon Johnson and his war."

CONNECTION NOT TOLD

The pamphlet was signed by "New Politics for Peace in Vietnam" and listed a Cambridge post office box number. Its connection with Dr. King, if any, was not disclosed.

Chester Hartman, a Harvard professor acting as executive director of the summer project, said Harvard students and faculty, headed by Prof. Gar Alperovitz, would begin fanning out across the Nation in a few weeks to recruit volunteers.

Telegrams endorsing the project were received from Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.), Harvard Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, the new head of Americans for Democratic Action, and others.

SEEKS \$700,000

Dr. King said he hopes to raise \$700,000 to finance the work.

"We view the Vietnam Summer project as a major organized follow-up to last week's massive peace demonstration," he said. "It will offer a constructive channel for all those who ask, 'what can I do?'"

"Perhaps 35 per cent, perhaps a majority of the people are deeply worried about the war," Dr. King said. "We hope the organizing efforts will translate this concern into effective political power against the war and against U.S. interventions elsewhere."

He said a central organization to coordinate the program would be formed, but he said the project would follow the pattern of the civil rights movement in that it would have no central control.

Dr. King said the civil rights movement had shown that "arrogant power can be made to yield to organized protest," adding: "Now

we must turn that same dedication, work and courage to the fight for peace."

Earlier, Dr. King told a news conference at Brown University in Providence, R.I., that anyone whose conscience told him the Vietnam war is wrong should declare himself a conscientious objector and avoid the draft.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOONSOCKET CALL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, the Woonsocket Call will join two other Rhode Island daily newspapers, the Westerly Sun and Pawtuxet Valley Daily Times, in celebrating their 75th anniversary.

Being a native of the city of Woonsocket, I have had the honor of knowing many of the people who have played a significant role in the development of the Woonsocket Call. Now I would like to share in their pride as they observe their 75th anniversary in the vital field of journalism.

The life of this newspaper and the lives of the people of Woonsocket are closely woven together and, therefore, all of us in the city of Woonsocket joyfully share in the growth which this newspaper has realized.

I am pleased to note that this great newspaper received its start from a group of Democrats, who, displeased with the coverage given to their activities in the Evening Reporter, joined together to form a new local newspaper in 1892. This paper was named the Evening Call. In 1908 it acquired the Evening Reporter and in 1917 was renamed the Woonsocket Call and Evening Reporter.

For the most part, this newspaper has been a family operation with members of the third and fourth generations of the original families presently in charge of publication operations.

The residents of Woonsocket and surrounding areas are proud of their newspaper and with good reason. It has served them well and has gained an enviable reputation in the field of journalism.

Newspapers such as this embody the very spirit of Americanism. They have made and continue to make a significant contribution toward the greatness of this Nation. For this we are most grateful.

I am sure that my colleagues in this body join me in saluting the Woonsocket Call, one of the fine local newspapers of our land.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Rumanians have lived in the eastern half of the Balkan Peninsula for an untold number of centuries. There they have tilled their productive land and at times made it the breadbasket of Eastern Europe. These sturdy and hard-working peasants have also lived in freedom, and have done their utmost to safeguard their independence. But they have not always been successful. Early in modern times the Ottoman Turks overran the country, making it a province of the Ottoman Empire. Until the mid-19th century the Rumanians lived under the rough and cruel Turkish regime, but they worked ceaselessly for their liberation. On numerous occasions they revolted against their oppressors, but were never successful until late in the last century.

In the 1870's the Balkan Peninsula was in political ferment; uprisings were taking place in many parts, and peoples were rebelling against the once-powerful Turkish regime there. Rumanians began their revolt, and, on May 10 of 1877, they proclaimed their independence from the Turks. During the ensuing Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 they were victorious with the effective aid of Russia, and the subsequent peace treaty guaranteed Rumania's freedom and independence. Thus May 10 of 1877 marked the Independence Day of Rumania.

Since those distant days the Rumanian people have had their joys and their woes, and today they are again deprived of their freedom in their homeland. Fortunately, the Communist totalitarian dictatorship there is not as oppressive today as it was until recently, and today it is claimed by "some" that these people enjoy a certain amount of freedom, though they are not allowed to observe their independence day.

However, Mr. Speaker, in December 1966, I visited Rumania with the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Europe of which I am chairman. I have, and will continue to have, love and respect for the people of Rumania. I am deeply concerned over the rule of the strong nationalistic aggressive Communist regime.

It is true the Ceausescu regime has attempted to project a "new image" but the new image is not evident on domestic policy. The rights of the individuals are denied to them.

We all look forward to their full freedom from Communist dictatorship and on the observance of their independence day we wish them peace in their homeland.

A PIONEER MATRIARCH AND COMMUNITY BUILDER

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of the Members of the House join me in extending condolences to our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative JOE L. EVINS, upon the passing of his mother earlier this week.

Mrs. Evins, the widow of the late James Edgar Evins and a member of a pioneer De Kalb County family, was, at the time of her death, the oldest native of her hometown of Smithville. Her late husband was the founder of Consolidated Bus Lines, the pioneer bus transportation company in the area. She was a life-long member of the Smithville Church of Christ and had been active in Red Cross activities. She served as secretary of the World War I selective service board in Smithville and had been most active in community affairs over a span of many years.

The passing of Mrs. Evins is not only a great loss to our colleague and her entire family—her brother, seven grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren—but to her community and, indeed, all of De Kalb County. She and her husband, through work and industry, had done much in building the local community.

Mrs. Evins possessed in abundance those traits of strength, honesty, and undeviating devotion to the Christian ideal and a firm belief in the importance of hard work. The true foundation of America's present greatness is the accomplishments and the strength of character of our pioneer generation of which Mrs. Evins was such an outstanding example.

A NONVOTING DELEGATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 9634, a bill which will implement the President's recommendation to provide a nonvoting Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives. I have introduced this bill today—May 3, 1967—to coincide with the 165th anniversary of the city of Washington, D.C.

This is an interim measure which would be effective until Congress proposes, and the States ratify, House Joint Resolution 396, the proposed constitutional amendment to provide the District with voting representation in the Congress.

While a Representative under my proposal could not vote, he could be heard. Such a voice, even as a minority of one, is essential to bring home to Congress the critical needs of the District. Moreover, in voting for such a Delegate, residents of the District will reflect their views at the ballot box. Certainly, such representation is the very least that should be granted by Congress to a city

with a population of about 800,000 residents.

There are many precedents for a nonvoting Delegate in Congress, some of which go back to earliest days. From 1789 until recently, when Alaska and Hawaii achieved statehood, the territories were represented in Congress by nonvoting delegates. Almost a century ago—from 1871 to 1874—the District had a nonvoting Representative in the House. In 1874 this position was abolished when Congress voted to end all forms of electoral franchise for the District of Columbia.

In the short span that the District was represented in Congress by a nonvoting delegate, the role played by him was impressive. He introduced many bills; he was appointed to the Committee for the District of Columbia, where he participated actively in its deliberations; and he engaged in debate. In 1874, the District delegate was regarded so highly as to be named chairman of the Select Committee on the Washington National Monument.

The bill introduced by me is consistent with prior precedents. It would provide that the nonvoting delegate shall be elected by the voters of the District for a term of 2 years. The delegate would have a seat in the House, with a right to participate in debate but not to vote. The House, under its rulemaking power, would determine the committees to which he would be assigned. In order to assure a delegate with both the necessary interest in, and knowledge of, the District's affairs, my bill requires that the delegate shall be at least 25 years old, as is required of a Representative; that he shall have lived in the District for at least 3 years prior to his election, and that he shall continue to live in the District during his term of office. He would be barred from holding any other public office during his term.

The bill would provide for a general election, and for nominations by party primaries or by petition. A runoff would be held if there are more than two candidates in a primary or in the general election and no one candidate receives as much as 40 percent of the total vote.

Technical and other changes are made in the District Election Act and related laws, designed to improve the election machinery. Enactment of this bill will thus also help lay the foundation for an orderly transition to the electoral system which will be required when voting representation for the District becomes effective.

This bill is not a home rule measure. I am a strong proponent of home rule; I believe the people of the District of Columbia should be given the right to elect their local officials and control their schools, welfare, police, and other services. But this bill will only provide that District of Columbia citizens have a voice in the National Congress.

The bill I am introducing today is similar, though not quite identical, to the bill introduced earlier by the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative NELSEN. I am hopeful

that hearings on these two bills can be held in the near future, and that we will receive strong bipartisan support in the District of Columbia Committee and in the full House.

This bill represents a modest beginning toward the goal of effective and responsive government for the District's residents. It is in the American tradition. I urge your wholehearted support.

RACE BY DECREE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a brief item in this morning's Washington Post described another example of the unspeakable apartheid policies of the Republic of South Africa. Under the headline "Race by Decree," the article told of an 11-year-old girl who has been classified as colored although the rest of her family is classified as white. The article follows:

PRETORIA.—South Africa's highest court upheld a Race Classification Board decision listing Sandra Laing, 11, as colored (of mixed blood), although her parents and their other children are listed as white. The girl, who formerly attended a school for white children, was reclassified in February, 1966, under South Africa's race laws. Justice Oscar Galt, while upholding the board's decision, noted it created "an impossible situation" within the family, and suggested the Secretary of the Interior might be able to change her classification.

FIESTA FLAMBEAU

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to eulogize and mourn the passing of an event of high excitement and community spirit in one of the most historic cities in the country, San Antonio, Tex. I refer to the extravagantly beautiful night parade, Fiesta Flambeau. More than 20 years ago, this parade was added as the fitting climax to the annual fiesta week celebrating the anniversary of the famous Battle of San Jacinto, and no single event has been engaged in with more affection by San Antonians since that time.

It was my distinct privilege to have a grand marshal of Fiesta Flambeau, and barely 4 years ago I accompanied our President, then Vice President, as the honored guest of the fiesta and the city. This year, as always, the verbal outbreak of the seasons naturally turned the energies of the entire San Antonio community into producing a pageant rivaling the beauties of nature herself. I must

pay tribute to the guiding light behind Fiesta Flambeau, Mr. Reynolds Andricks, and acknowledge our debt to him and his lovely, charming wife for another celebration that exceeded even our high expectations.

I trust that many of my colleagues will be attending Hemis-Fair 1968, which begins next spring, and I urge them to attend next year's Fiesta Flambeau for a truly marvelous experience.

COL. JAMES A. GUNN III

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an extraordinary combat commander, Col. James A. Gunn III, who retired last Saturday in a fitting ceremony, complete with parade and reception, at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., where he had been vice commander of the Lackland Military Training Center. My district of San Antonio is honored that Colonel Gunn and his lovely family are making their home with us. Colonel Gunn has already given of his talents to many San Antonio civic activities, so we are both honored and beneficiaries.

Col. James Gunn began his military career in 1939, completing pilot training. In December 1943 he was assigned to the European-African-Middle East theater where he served as a bombardment group deputy commander and commander. He flew 165 hours on 32 combat missions, and was shot down near the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania on August 17, 1944. He remained a prisoner of war only 10 days, however, before being repatriated. He flew from Rumania to Italy in the fuselage of a Rumanian ME-109, to present plans for liberating hundreds of prisoners of war.

We are so familiar with our debts to our servicemen of the present, that all too often we forget the exploits and heroism of even the recent past. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an account of Colonel Gunn's clearheaded patriotism, as printed in the *Aerospace Historian* in their autumn 1966 issue:

ESCAPE FROM RUMANIA

(By Col. James A. Gunn, U.S. Air Force)

Beginning in the early part of World War II the major bombing effort of the Army Air Forces was aimed toward reducing the effectiveness of the Nazi war machine by striking at its industrial back-up. Factories producing war materials, assembly plants, and refineries became the objects of systematic hammering by the bombers of the 15th, 8th and 9th Air Forces.

Petroleum refining capability was early singled out as an important part of this effort. In addition to refineries in Austria and Germany, those in Rumania were singled out for their importance to the Nazi war effort.

The first bombing of the 13 major complexes surrounding the city of Ploesti was the famous low-level raid on Aug. 1, 1943, and during the ensuing years these refineries

were struck again and again by bombers of the 8th and 15th Air Forces.

The RAF also made a few night sorties against Ploesti during 1944. The final bombings of the Ploesti area came in August 1944, after an intensive series of bombings beginning on Aug. 17 and continuing until the announcement of Rumania's capitulation on Aug. 23.

On Aug. 17, 1944, only a month after assuming command of the 454th Bombardment Group at Cerignola, Italy (upon the departure of Col. Horace D. Aynsworth), it fell my lot to be shot down on one of the Ploesti missions. On that particular day a new tactic was being tried. Because of the smoke screens being put each time the Rumanians received an air raid warning, we had resorted largely to radar runs and accurate strikes had become more and more difficult to achieve.

It had long been accepted that the more individual aimings the better the final results. As a consequence, on this day, the 454th Bomb Group and several other B-24 and B-17 Groups of the 15th Air Force were making runs on the target in a column of squadrons rather than in the usual pattern of group formations. I had led the formation to the target area, but dropped to the number two position in the squadron for the bomb run because of an inoperative radar, and turned the lead over to Capt. John E. Porter.

During the run in from the initial point and just prior to releasing our bombs, we were struck by unusually accurate flak, with the result that four of the eight aircraft in the lead squadron were shot down, including mine.

Our bomb run had been at 24,000 feet and we had abandoned the aircraft at a rather high altitude because of an aircraft fire. Consequently, I was blown quite a distance from the target area. Upon landing I was soon captured by a mob of Rumanian civilians who took me into the small town of Cornul. There I was treated well and, after a period of time, learned that I was about to be sent to the city of Ploesti under guard.

The trip was made in a commandeered civilian vehicle. Upon arriving in Ploesti, I found that all but one of my crew members had survived and had been brought to the Rumanian Army headquarters in Ploesti. A few crew members from other groups were there too, but it was some time before I found that there had also been four survivors from Captain Porter's aircraft, including Captain Porter himself.

After two days at the temporary Ploesti confinement facility (where we slept in bed-bug-infested accommodations), we were taken by truck to an interrogation camp on the outskirts of Bucharest, where we were interrogated for two days. Then we were taken to the permanent prisoner of war camp in Bucharest, where I found that I was the senior officer.

There were over 1,100 American prisoners of war in Rumania. Some 400 officers were in a schoolhouse on the south side of Bucharest. Most of our enlisted men were in a camp on the opposite side of the city, and approximately 100 survivors from the initial August 1943 raid were in a camp at Timisul de Jus, just to the south of Brasov (in the Transylvania Alps).

Our prison experiences were similar to those to be found in dozens of other stories until Aug. 23. There was a coordinated effort by a party of several teams to dig out underneath the schoolhouse. At the time I entered the camp a hole big enough to accommodate a man's body had been chiseled about halfway through a four foot concrete abutment.

Work was slow because tools were poor and work could be done only when no guard was within hearing distance. The prison fare was austere and course but prior to my arrival the officers had made an arrangement to buy supplemental food.

On Aug. 23 the routine aspect of POW life changed drastically. A radio had been procured somehow. It was kept hidden in a fireplace chimney during the day and brought out each night to listen to the BBC news broadcasts. That night we learned from the news broadcast that King Michael of Rumania had announced his nation's capitulation to the Allies. Later we learned of the overthrow of Antonescu, the Nazi puppet, and the establishment of an interim government under Dr. Maniu.

Upon receipt of this joyous news the camp went wild. Many of the POW's had been there for months, and a few had been there more than a year. The prospect of liberation was exhilarating.

The next morning we were visited by a Rumanian Army colonel who assembled us and spoke favorably of the turn of events. He advised us to remain at the prison camp until further instructions were received. However, the fences were opened and we were no longer restricted to the area of the camp. Soon after his departure we were visited by Princess Catherine Caradja, now well known in this country, who asked for an opportunity to speak to us. I assembled the officers.

She did not speak with the joy shown by the Army colonel. As a matter of fact, this lady showed great distress because she feared the day would come when her country would be overrun and occupied by the Russians. With unusually clear perception and foresight she went on to tell us in rather positive terms that imposition of such a Russian Communist regime was probably the worst thing that could happen to her little country. This very forceful talk was received rather strangely by some of our young officers because, after all, the Russians were our allies in this effort to beat down the Nazi war machine.

At approximately 9 a.m. on Aug. 24, only a few hours after King Michael's announcement, we were greeted with the sound of air raid sirens, which shortly were to be followed by the bursting of bombs. For more than two days and nights the Germans bombed the city of Bucharest almost incessantly. The formations of *Stukas* and the HE 111's were small, and the bombs they were dropping appeared to be about the equivalent of our 250 pound HE bombs.

As soon as the bombing began, what had been mere disorder became chaos. This situation continued in Bucharest as long as I was there. After the visit of Princess Caradja I had been unable to locate a single Rumanian individual in authority. On visiting the enlisted men's camp, I found the same situation there. I did not restrict the POW's at either camp to the confines of the prisons, but instructed them to stay within the city and take refuge in shelters or basements during bombings.

Rumor had reached us that the Germans intended to single out the camps as targets. Most of us doubted this and I asked that the POW's keep in touch at the schoolhouse for further instructions.

Several of us began to search for any Rumanians with authority. I planned to make two requests: first, that our prisoners of war be removed from the city of Bucharest to somewhere in the country in order to be away from the area being so severely bombed by the Germans, and, second, I wanted some means of getting in touch with the Allied authorities in Italy to begin arrangements for evacuating the prisoners.

I soon learned that all of the major means of communications in Bucharest had been bombed by the Germans and there was no operative radio or wire service through which I could communicate with the Allies. The telephone building in downtown Bucharest had received several direct bomb hits. The War Department building was in a shambles, and had been completely evacuated. For a

considerable period of time, I could locate no one ranking higher than a staff sergeant. The hierarchy of authority had collapsed. Finally, through the services of a sergeant on a motorcycle (who spoke English), I was put in touch with an officer and, ultimately, was taken to a temporary War Department headquarters which had been established in some recreational buildings in a woods several miles outside Bucharest.

I soon found that the senior man present was the Secretary of War, Lieutenant General Racovita. He saw me almost immediately. When I described the miserable circumstances of our POW's, General Racovita immediately agreed to arrange for the evacuation of American and Allied prisoners to another camp a few miles away.

Once this agreement had been concluded, I broached the subject of borrowing an airplane so that I might fly to Italy to arrange for the evacuation of our prisoners of war. I also promised to arrange for a strike against the German bombers which were dumping bombs on Bucharest around the clock. The airfield from which the Germans were operating was the Banasea Airfield, less than 15 miles north of Bucharest. At this suggestion General Racovita for the first time began to look with some favor upon my suggestion.

I was anxious to get started right then and there. I asked for an airplane that very night, but was told that it was not that simple, that approval of several high level officials must be obtained.

Somewhere along the way I had previously met a Mr. Rico Georgescu, Rumania's Secretary of State and Minister of National Economy. At the conclusion of my conversation with General Racovita, and with the assurance that I would hear from him again soon, Mr. Georgescu appeared on the scene and I was invited to spend the night at his residence.

Incongruously, that night we had a beautifully prepared steak dinner in a downtown restaurant—with the sound of ground fighting between the Germans and Rumanians on all sides. This was punctuated by the occasional wall of sirens followed by the German bombings.

Throughout the night there were many telephone calls on what appeared to be a "field phone" system at the Georgescu residence and several visitors came to discuss my proposed departure for Italy. They wanted to know just what type of strike I could arrange against the German-held airfield. I told them that it would be either a bomber strike or strafing by our fighters but gave reasonable assurance that the effectiveness of the German bombing unit could be effectively decreased if not eliminated.

We retired about 4 a.m. I was awakened early to be taken by Mr. Georgescu for an interview with the Secretary of the Rumanian Air Force. Through an interpreter, he told me that arrangements had been made for me to be flown to Italy in a Savoia Marchetti (an ancient model of an Italian twin-engine aircraft). Soon we were on our way to Ploesti Airdrome for the takeoff.

There I found that a Rumanian commander and a crew of two enlisted people were to fly me to Italy. I later was told that the enlisted men, who were wearing sidearms, had been put on board to guard me. Everyone seemed to be suspicious of me and feared that I might attempt to murder the pilot and take over the aircraft. I had no such thought.

Unfortunately, some 20 minutes after the takeoff, the pilot, who spoke no English, returned to Popesti Airdrome. I was told he said he had engine trouble although I detected none. Either he had no stomach for the mission or he was called back by radio.

As I stepped out of the aircraft I was met by a Rumanian captain by the name of Constantin Cantacuzino. He proved to be a royal Rumanian family member and a commander

of the fighter group in Bucharest. He spoke to me in excellent English, saying, "If you will ride in the belly of a Messerschmidt, I will take you to Italy." I agreed without hesitation. The Germans were still bombing and, as far as I knew, the American POW's were still in the prisoner of war camps within the city limits. (I was told later, that they had actually been evacuated on Aug. 26, in accordance with General Racovita's promise.)

As Captain Cantacuzino and I began talking about the preparations for the trip to Italy, Secretary of State Georgescu again showed up, saying that the Interim President of the new government wished to see me. So I was taken to Dr. Maniu, the Interim President, who, through an interpreter, made a most impassioned plea that upon arriving in Italy I immediately make recommendations in the name of the Rumanian government for occupation of that country by either British or American forces.

On every side there was evidence of terror at the prospect of Russian occupation, and President Maniu was no exception. I promised to carry out his request, and did so upon returning to Italy.

I was eager to be off and somewhat perturbed by the insistence of Captain Cantacuzino in planning the flight with great and meticulous care. He continued to point out that I would be buckled inside the fuselage and in the event of being shot down or a crash landing, my lot would be none too good. We sifted through the store of maps and to my dismay there was not a single useable map of Italy to be found. So I sat down with pen and ink and drew a detailed map of Italy on a piece of cardboard. From this I briefed Cantacuzino. Then I sketched a smaller and more detailed map, about the size of a shirt stiffener, on which I noted the barrage balloon locations and AA gun positions, together with outstanding landmarks which would be used for pilotage after crossing the Adriatic.

I advised crossing the Adriatic at minimum level in order to avoid radar detection, but Cantacuzino objected. After considerable discussion, I reluctantly went along with Cantacuzino's plan, which was to begin the crossing at the maximum altitude.

As I would have no source of oxygen, we agreed on an altitude of 6,500 meters, which approximates 19,000 feet. His plan was to proceed at this altitude to a point approximately one-half way across the Adriatic and then nose down into a long shallow dive but with enough power to make the last portion of the flight as fast as possible, thus reducing the possibility of interception by American fighters.

On the cardboard map I drew in the details necessary to find the San Giovanni Airfield near Cerignola, which was my home base. As I had flown in and out of this base many times, I was able to rely on my memory to give him precise distances and headings from known landmarks.

Another part of our plan was the painting of an American flag on each side of the ME-109G in order to lessen the possibility of an attack by American interceptors upon reaching Italy. While the painting was being done, Captain Cantacuzino pulled me aside and expressed some alarm over the fact that the plans for our proposed flight were now quite widely known. We were in the heart of an area where allies and enemies intermingled and on some occasions it was difficult to tell one from the other. Captain Cantacuzino understandably feared that we might be shot down by German fighters soon after take-off.

He cleverly suggested that we broadcast the news that we would be leaving at dawn the next morning, Aug. 28, but we actually would leave that afternoon as soon as the painting of the flags was finished. I agreed to this and only Mr. Georgescu, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Air Force were given information of the true takeoff time.

I was outfitted with heavy leather flying

clothing and the radio equipment was removed from the belly of the Messerschmidt to make room for me. Means of access into the fuselage was an inspection plate about 18 inches square on the left side of the fuselage which was held in place by four snap type fasteners.

When the painting of the American flags was almost completed, according to pre-arranged plans between Cantacuzino and myself, he fitted me into the fuselage on the pretext of just trying out the space. However, once I was inside the fuselage, he slipped the cover on, jumped into the cockpit, and in a matter of moments we were on our way to Italy.

The flight to Italy was uneventful and according to plan. Just opposite my head in the fuselage I discovered that by pulling on a spring I could open a small kickplate which was used as a stirrup by the pilot to enter the cockpit. By pulling this plate open, I was able to peek through the hole and see when we were over water and when we had crossed the shoreline of Italy.

In accordance with my instructions, Captain Cantacuzino (who was a superb pilot with 54 fighter victories to his credit), followed the plan I had put on cardboard with great precision. As I had directed him, he followed a stream until coming to a specific landmark on the left side, which I was able to peek out of my peephole, and then turned to the right to a heading of 340°, which took him directly over San Giovanni Airstrip, home of the 454th and 455th Bomb Groups.

In view of the fact that we had British-manned 40mm guns around the perimeter of the airport, I had instructed Cantacuzino to lower his gear and flaps upon approaching the airstrip and make a slow, straight in approach while rocking his wings slowly.

I felt sure that no one would fire at even a Messerschmidt coming in in this manner. However, upon reaching the airstrip, Cantacuzino made the decision that a straight-in approach would be too great a risk because of a tail wind. Consequently, he circled the airdrome with gear and flaps down and nose high, rocking his wings slowly as I had instructed him to do.

I was told later that the AA gunners followed us around the pattern with their 40mm's but not only did they recognize the friendly type of approach, they were able to see the American flags painted on the sides of the aircraft. I felt a great sense of relief when I felt the aircraft rolling down my home runway.

Upon being pulled from the fuselage of the aircraft, I found that I was hypoxic and dizzy. As soon as I gained my equilibrium, I telephoned 15th Air Force headquarters at Bari, asking for Gen. Nathan F. Twining. In his absence, I spoke to Brig. Gen. Charles Born, the chief of operations. Following that, I called Col. Fay Upthegrove, commander of the 304th Wing, advising him I was back and had already called 15th Air Force.

As soon as we had a hasty bite to eat, Cantacuzino and I were hustled off to Bari, which was about an hour's drive. Planning was begun that night for fighter strikes against the German bombardment unit at Banasea Airdrome, and for evacuation of the prisoners of war in Rumania.

A strike was made against Banasea the next day by the 99th Fighter Group, which was followed on subsequent days by other fighter and bombardment units of the 15th Air Force. By Sept. 3 a total of 1,161 prisoners of war had been evacuated from Ploesti Airdrome by B-17.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1967—AMERICA'S KEY TO THE FUTURE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it was a dramatic day in American legislative history when President Johnson signed into law on April 11, 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. He said then:

The House of Representatives, by a vote of 263 to 153, and the Senate, by vote of 73 to 18, passed the most sweeping educational bill ever to come before Congress. It represents a major new commitment of the Federal Government to quality and equality in the schooling that we offer our young people.

Apart from the nationwide impact of the President's remarks, I recall their very personal impact on me. As a first-term Representative in Congress, I felt proud to be included among the 263 Representatives supporting that historic bill, and prouder still to have been a member of the House committee which favorably reported out of committee the measure which became the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I have gone through the "growing pains" with this far-reaching legislation since becoming a Congressman from Maine only a few months before the act was signed into law. And, as proud, and as apprehensive, as any parent, I have closely watched the progress of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am proud to tell you today, based on reports, and on testimony I have heard before the House Committee on Education and Labor after more than 1 full year of its operation, that the success of various programs made possible by the act has been outstanding. These programs have injected new quality and opportunity into the education offered to America's young people.

An excerpt from the evaluation report from my State of Maine on the first year's operation of title I illustrates the impact that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has made:

For the first time . . . school personnel have been able to provide special attention to the educationally disadvantaged children, and to concentrate their efforts in an attempt to meet the needs of these children. The reported results have been most rewarding. . . . Thousands of children have been helped.

H.R. 7819—the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 as reported—will allow these programs to continue, and to reach additional thousands of schoolchildren.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendments proposed in H.R. 7819. These amendments will further strengthen, extend, and improve educational programs for elementary and secondary school children begun under authority of the act passed in 1965. For example, the participation of Indian children and children in overseas Department of Defense schools will be extended through fiscal year 1969. The National Teacher Corps program will be amended and extended. Provision will be made for comprehensive educational

planning. Educational and related services for handicapped children will be extended and improved. The assistance provision for schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster will be amended.

I view the adoption of all of these amendments as necessary to continuing and improving upon the commitment made by the Federal Government to our Nation's schoolchildren 2 years ago, and I should like to outline some of their important provisions.

"Title I: Education of Children From Low-Income Families," has truly proven to be the "chance for a change" for thousands of school systems serving millions of schoolchildren. Over 17,000 school districts have taken advantage of the opportunities provided under this title to provide services ranging from remedial reading, hot meals, health services, summer science programs, and student-parent night classes to over 8 million disadvantaged schoolchildren who would not otherwise have received such services. Compensatory educational services were provided to children in densely populated urban centers, as well as to children in isolated rural areas.

The majority of the title I projects were directed to reading and language skills, without which it is becoming increasingly difficult for a person to function in our increasingly complex society. Correcting communication deficiencies at an early age, will prove to be of inestimable value in later years.

This is one type of the more than 22,000 projects carried out under title I, a number which indicates the need for such a Federal program and the desire and ability of State and local educational agencies to utilize title I funds. H.R. 7819 would provide authorization to continue to meet the obvious needs served by title I, and would further amend this title to meet the educational needs of disadvantaged children by:

Extending title I authorization for 1 year;

Allowing the participation of Indian children on reservations;

Increasing the dollar limitation on State administrative expenses to \$150,000;

Using AFDC data for January of the preceding fiscal year in computing the allocation formula;

Requiring that all projects using education aids provide a joint coordinated program of training for such aids and the professional staff they assist;

Providing that allocations beyond the amount used by the local education agency be used within the State to remedy inequities caused by population shifts and economic changes, before being re-allocated among the States;

Counting for allocation purposes a child of a migratory agricultural worker even if he remains up to 5 years in a school district, and by requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the burden imposed on a school district by low-rent public housing and to report the findings to the Congress before January 10, 1968.

H.R. 7819 further amends title I by adding a new "Part B: Utilization of Teachers From the National Teacher Corps." This part would make corps

members available to areas having high concentrations of low-income families. Teacher Corps members would be allocated among the States according to their number of low-income children. For this purpose \$21 million is authorized for fiscal year 1968, \$25 million for fiscal year 1969 and sums necessary to complete practical and academic training for enrollees in 1970. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to enter into arrangements with local education agencies, on approval of the appropriate State agency, to furnish Teacher Corps teams—an experienced teacher and teacher-interns—and to pay part or all of their compensation.

The experienced teacher would receive a salary agreed to by the local educational agency and the teacher-intern would receive the lowest rate paid by the school system or \$75 per week plus \$15 per dependent, whichever is lower. The corps teachers would not be used to replace regular teachers.

Control over the corps members would rest completely with the local agency. Thus, this highly successful program, designed to attract and prepare teachers of disadvantaged children, created and authorized under part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would be continued and appropriations for part B of title V would also be used.

Before January 10, 1968, the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Commerce shall report to the Congress on ways to establish entitlements under part A—the original title I—on the basis of data later than 1960, and to make recommendations for necessary legislation. The 2-year combined pre-service and inservice program incorporating year-round academic instruction with practical classroom experience has served to meet a very real shortage of qualified teachers in urban slums and in depressed rural areas. It has also served as a stimulus for curriculum changes at teacher training institutions throughout the Nation. On the basis of testimony I have heard, I am sincerely committed to its continuance as proposed in H.R. 7819.

"Title II: Textbooks, Library Books, and Other Instructional Materials," appropriated \$100 million during fiscal year 1966 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and outlying areas. Over 43 million students and 1.8 million teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools benefited from this appropriation. Prior to 1965 more than two out of three public elementary schools had no library at all. Title II has made possible the establishment of over 3,400 new public elementary school libraries and 200 new public secondary school libraries, and the expansion of over 41,500 public elementary school libraries and 66,600 public secondary school libraries. Forty-five States authorized more than 50 percent of their allotment for school library resources—an indication of the dearth of such materials previous to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Nineteen States, six for the first time, added school library supervisors to their staffs, in addition to providing for 112 new positions in 48 States.

These statistics give evidence of the fact that title II has met a very real need. To meet another great need, provision was made last year for the participation of Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. H.R. 7819 extends this provision through fiscal year 1969, as well as the authorization for the whole title II program.

"Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services," offered the opportunity to teachers, administrators, and community representatives of various interests to seek innovative solutions to the unique educational problems of a particular community. Since April 1965 over 4,000 proposals for title III projects have been submitted. Almost 1,500 projects costing over \$108 million have been funded, including projects recently approved during the second approval period of fiscal year 1967 and announced on April 12. For example, title III project in Wells, Maine, was approved during this period: A cultural enrichment program for fifth- and sixth-grade students in a rural, low-income area will include field trips, youth concerts, special movies, visiting artists and authors, naturalists and historians, and the Portland Children's Theater.

Title III programs such as this have affected and enriched the educational experiences of over 10 million persons—preschool children, school dropouts, teachers, parents, and other adults and elementary and secondary school children in public and nonpublic schools throughout the United States. Reports made directly to me, presented before the committee, indicate that the project approval procedure now operating has proved very successful.

H.R. 7819 provides for extension of the participation of Indian children in BIA schools and children in DOD overseas dependents schools through fiscal year 1969, and the extension for 1 year of the other provisions of the title. I certainly hope that the projects which have truly advanced creativity in education, and which have involved the cooperation of representatives from all of the groups which make up a whole community will be allowed to continue and to improve.

Authorization of all of the above titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, have necessarily made great demands on the State educational agencies responsible for administering them and for coordinating all of the other educational activities within a State. To many State departments of education, already understaffed and unable to meet leadership, planning, and administrative demands prior to passage of the act, "Title V: Strengthening State Educational Agencies," has proved to be a most welcome, indeed necessary, part of the whole Elementary and Secondary Education Act legislation.

Eighty-five percent of the \$17 million appropriated for the first year of operation was available to the States in the form of basic grants. These grants were used to study, plan, develop, and evaluate education programs and research. To carry out these functions, 1,000 personnel were added to the State departments of

education. Under the 15-percent special projects portion of title V, 15 major projects to improve the leadership capabilities of State departments of education were funded, employing 126 professional and 82 nonprofessional personnel, with 48 States participating to some degree. Many States pooled their resources and engaged in cooperative projects of mutual, regional, interstate concern.

Two years ago, in enacting title V the Congress responded to President Johnson's statement that—

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

Today we have the opportunity to respond again to meet State educational agencies' leadership needs. H.R. 7819 extends title V eligibility to the Trust Territory of the Pacific. The apportionment formula for grants to strengthen State departments of education is amended to provide that 40 percent of the funds apportioned be allotted among the States in equal amounts and the remaining 60 percent be allotted on the basis of public school enrollment. This will correct the inequity of the current formula which apportions funds among the States strictly on the basis of public school enrollment.

To allow the States to conduct systematic, comprehensive, long-range planning at all levels, something that is essential to future educational development, but for which few States have the resources now, a new part B would be added to title V. This addition would authorize funds for comprehensive and continuing planning at the State level, with 25 percent of the funds reserved to the Commissioner for special project grants and contracts to be conducted on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan basis. Of the remaining funds, 40 percent would be allotted among the States equally and 60 percent on the basis of population. To be eligible for planning grants, the State educational agency shall be the planning agency responsible for submitting an application to the Commissioner of Education setting forth the States' educational goals. If a State so chooses, higher education planning may be included, handled by a separate, coordinating planning agency.

Finally, H.R. 7819 provides that \$65 million be authorized: 70 percent for "Part A: Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education," and 30 percent for "Part B: Grants for Comprehensive Educational Planning and Evaluation." Approval of these proposed amendments to title V presents to us the opportunity to add another dimension to the State educational agencies' leadership and planning capabilities.

Last year Congress added a new title to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. "Title VI: Education of Handicapped Children," promises when funded, to provide the assistance necessary to meet the personnel and program support needs for the handicapped children in our country. On January 12 of this year, in accordance with title VI provision, a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established in the Office of Education. This Bureau, by centralizing all federally supported educa-

tional programs for handicapped children, promises to provide administrative and coordinating capabilities which should be of great benefit to our handicapped school-age children.

To provide further assurance that these children will be provided quality educational opportunities, H.R. 7819 adds a new part B to title VI. Recognizing that early identification and educational evaluation of a handicapping condition is an essential first step in the optimum development of every child, \$7.5 million is authorized to establish regional resources centers for: testing and educational evaluation of handicapped children; development of education programs to meet special needs of handicapped children; and assistance to schools and other agencies in a region to provide educational programs for the handicapped child.

Part B would also authorize \$1 million for fiscal year 1968 and 1969 to be used for nationwide recruitment of special education personnel to help meet the urgent demand for over 200,000 such personnel within the next decade. Part of this \$1 million would be used to disseminate information to prospective personnel, parents, teachers, and other interested persons concerning educational opportunities for handicapped children. The highly successful captioned films for the deaf program is authorized to be expanded to include all areas of the handicapped, and is funded by \$1 million for fiscal year 1968 and 1969. In order to utilize the benefits of research and demonstration conducted by private agencies and organizations contracts as well as grants for research in education of the handicapped are authorized. The inclusion of Indian children in BIA schools and children in DOD overseas dependents schools is extended to title VI in keeping with the provisions in the other titles of H.R. 7819. Finally, the definition of "handicapped" in title VI, cited as the "Education of the Handicapped Act," is amended by striking "seriously" from the term "emotionally disturbed." I sincerely feel that the adoption by the Congress of part B to title VI, in addition to the funding of part A, will provide the assistance needed to enable the States to provide equitable educational and related opportunities to the children in this country handicapped to some degree by a mental or physical health impairment.

In conclusion I would like to mention that Public Law 81-815 and Public Law 81-874—federally affected areas—are amended by H.R. 7819 to clarify the definition of "Federal property" and to extend and broaden the provisions for assistance for school construction and current expenditures in major disaster areas through fiscal year 1972.

As I mentioned when I began, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been of personal and continuing interest to me. I have followed and supported, after careful scrutiny, all of its provisions as originally passed and as amended last year. I consider the amendments of 1967 contained in H.R. 7819 to be both necessary and wise and I wholeheartedly urge you to support this bill.

CRIME REMAINS A CAUSE FOR PUBLIC CONCERN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, this administration has given clear notice that crime will neither be tolerated nor ignored in the United States. And it has moved with great resolution in drafting the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act now before Congress.

This measure would enable the Federal Government to give badly needed financial support to local police agencies throughout the country. There could be a more effective campaign waged immediately against crime and the criminal.

In addition, the administration has proposed programs that would be equally effective, for they would remove many of the causes of crime. We can achieve substantial results only if both approaches are used.

It is plain that crime is a foremost concern among our people today. One of the most interesting assessments of the problem came recently from the Kansas City Star. In an editorial, the Star asked:

What is the use, for instance, of building new parks if people are afraid to use them.

I have unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Mar. 31, 1967]
CRIME REMAINS A CAUSE FOR PUBLIC CONCERN

Crime and public safety continue to occupy the country's attention. President Johnson emphasized his concern this week by an unexpected appearance at the national conference on crime control. The President spoke for his anti-crime bill (\$50 million dollars in federal aid for various state, county and city programs) and he painted a rather bleak picture of the institutions which many of the delegates represented.

Mr. Johnson said that "many police forces are inadequately trained and organized"; that "prison facilities themselves sometimes are major breeders of crime" and that "congested courts can produce assembly-line justice which sometimes is no justice at all." Police, prisons and criminal courts primarily are state and city responsibilities. We are sure that many of the prosecutors, police chiefs and judges in the audience would agree with the President. The Jackson County prosecutor must have wished that members of the Missouri Legislature could have heard the words and applied them to his prosecutor's bill.

The same is true of the Citizens Conference on Missouri Courts which has withdrawn its court-reform measure because the Legislature couldn't get to it in this session.

Thus the federal government continues to move actively into fields where the states have performed beneath public expectations. In the case of crime, we believe the public will welcome the federal assistance.

For there can be no question that people increasingly are preoccupied with worry over the crime increase that is blighting this society. It is tragic when government builds parks that people sometimes are afraid to use; that elevators in shining apartment buildings are places of danger, and that a storekeeper or service station attendant must

wonder whether a man is a customer or a robber.

The President reiterated a basic conclusion of his commission on law enforcement, that the long-range struggle against crime must cover all aspects of social dislocation: Poverty, mental illness, discrimination and poor education. Yet he did seem to place some insistence on dealing with the immediate crisis which means improved law enforcement and more efficient courts. Most Americans, we believe, concur with the proposition that slums, ignorance and hunger breed crime. And most of them will appreciate the rather urgent tone of the President's remarks that seems to call for decisive action now. Long-term programs aren't enough.

SPEECH BY MR. BENSON FORD, VICE PRESIDENT OF FORD MOTOR CO.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, today the 70 millionth vehicle built by the Ford Motor Co., in the United States rolls off the assembly line at the company's plant in Norfolk, Va.

I have been gratified by the confidence of Ford Co. officials in the growth of Virginia's largest city, which, coincidentally, is in my district, by its expansion of its Norfolk operation. This is an excellent plant with as outstanding a group of employees as can be found. In view of the occasion which is being celebrated in Norfolk this week, it is appropriate that Mr. Benson Ford, vice president of Ford Motor Co., was the guest speaker at the annual banquet and congressional dinner of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce on Monday.

Mr. Ford's remarks follow and I commend them to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY BENSON FORD

I want to start off with a word of reassurance for all of you who wage the daily struggle with the intricate problems of government and business. Sometimes you may wonder whether there really is such a thing as an easy decision to make. I can tell you the answer is "yes." I know because I had the experience myself only a few weeks ago. I was asked whether I would like to address the combined Annual Banquet and Congressional Dinner of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce.

I had at least four good reasons, some personal and some business, for readily accepting the invitation.

The first one is completely personal. I am highly honored at being asked. In fact, since this is a combination of two outstanding events, I am doubly honored.

My second reason is that Ford Motor Company is proud to call itself an industrial citizen of Virginia. Through some excellent—if coincidental—timing, on the day after tomorrow we are taking special cognizance of Virginia's contribution to our company's progress when the 70 millionth vehicle built by Ford in the United States rolls off the assembly line at our plant in Norfolk. We hope that many of you will be there for our observance of this significant milestone.

My third reason for accepting the invitation for tonight veers back toward the personal. It's not often these days that an auto-

mobile man gets to talk before this many members of the Congress on a subject of his own choosing.

And that brings me to my fourth reason. The recent Virginia Trade Mission to Europe makes world trade a timely subject for this occasion, and it is one in which Ford Motor Company shares a very vital interest.

I understand the mission was unusually successful, which is a tribute both to the quality of Virginia products and to the abilities of the Virginians who made the trip. It is not an easy job to sell abroad, and tonight I want to discuss a few of the obstacles and why it is important that they be surmounted.

Ford Motor Company's involvement with the world market goes all the way back to 1903 when my grandfather founded the company. Of the handful of Ford cars made that year, one went to England and one to the Far East.

Today, we sell cars, trucks, tractors, household appliances, radios, television sets and many other products throughout the world. In the automotive field, aside from our U.S. and Canadian product lines, we manufacture a complete British Ford line of cars and trucks, nearly as complete a line of cars and a light truck series in Germany, and Australian Falcons and Fairlans derived from their North American namesakes. We manufacture and assemble motor vehicles in 18 countries and have sales companies in 11 more. In addition, we supply dealer-assemblers in seven countries, and operate 10 overseas district sales offices which supply dealers in 94 more countries.

I offer this brief and incomplete sketch of our worldwide operations to indicate that we have a full appreciation of the problems and difficulties of entering new markets. We don't pretend to have found all the answers yet, but there is tangible evidence that we have found some of them. For the last two years in a row, we have led all world auto manufacturers in retail sales of cars and trucks outside North America.

The world auto market illustrates one of the big changes in the world trade picture in recent years. After World War II, America's goal was not only to strengthen the American economy through expansion of trade, but to assist the economic recovery of the rest of the free world.

Although much remains to be accomplished among developing nations, how well our industrialized friends have succeeded is reflected in the fact that car and truck sales outside the United States have more than doubled since the late 1950's. In the mid-Fifties, the U.S. market accounted for two-thirds of all motor vehicle sales, but now more cars and trucks are being sold outside the United States than within.

This is all the more remarkable because, as you know, the U.S. market has not been standing still by any means. Even the current market slowdown is a relative matter. This year is still shaping up as the third best we have ever known, exceeded only by the nine million and more new car sales of 1965 and 1966.

For the next decade, we expect car sales in the United States to increase at a compound rate of 3.4 per cent per year, which would mean normal sales of 11½ million new cars by 1975.

Exciting as that prospect is, the rest of the free world market is moving even faster. Our most conservative estimates look for a compound growth rate of at least 5½ per cent until 1972, tapering to somewhere between 4 and 4½ per cent for the following five years.

The ability to buy automobiles and trucks is only one indication of the comeback made by many of the world's economies. Japan, now the showplace of free enterprise and democracy in the troubled Far East, has

become an industrial power to rival West Germany, Great Britain and France. In fact, Japan expects to rank right behind the United States and the Soviet Union in five years.

The economic resurgence of other countries, so ardently desired by us in those lonely days of the Cold War, has been largely owing to the initiative and hard work of their peoples, to be sure. But in very large part, it has been the growth of world trade that allowed them to put their energies to fruitful use. The lowering of trade barriers and easing of currency restrictions stimulated competition, permitted more economical production through enlarging their markets, and resulted in cheaper sources of supply for producers and consumers alike.

Within the European Common Market, where internal tariffs for industrial products will be abolished completely by next year, industrial production increased by 58 per cent from 1958 to 1965. By creating a closely knit market of some 180 million people, the six countries have been able to make a more rational use of their resources, manpower and technological knowledge.

For all the prosperity greater world trade has brought, however, it is still running a rocky course. Trade barriers and protectionism are still too strong to permit maximum economic benefits from trade among developed nations or an adequate rate of growth among many developing nations.

Although the European Common Market's regional trade represents progress on one side of the coin, there is another side. As the Common Market's internal tariffs drop, its external tariffs automatically become more effective barriers to outside nations trying to compete within the walls. Meanwhile, Britain has renewed her interest in joining the Common Market, but continues to meet resistance both at home and among the Common Market countries. Europe continues to be divided into three trading blocs: the Common Market, the European Free Trade Association and the Communist nations.

The protectionism sentiment has been reflected in the hard sledding of the "Kennedy round" of GATT negotiations, into which we entered so hopefully four years ago. It is strongly reflected in the less developed countries where import quotas, local content requirements and numerous other restrictive devices are employed to nurture budding local industries. Yet progress toward free trade areas in Latin America and other developing regions, where industrialization could be speeded up through lower costs and prices of integrated manufacturing and marketing, has been painfully and haltingly slow.

When the international exchange of goods and capital investment demonstrably works so well in improving the lot of the human race, why is there still so much resistance? A root cause, it seems to me, lies somewhat paradoxically in the very developments that make more international exchange possible—the improved communications and transportation that make this what we are often pleased to call "a small world."

It seems entirely logical to assume that more contact between the various peoples of the world should promote better international understanding. Traffic congestion problems in Calcutta, Turkish teenagers listening to rock 'n' roll on their transistor radios and European homes equipped with the latest household appliances look like common denominators between us all.

The problem is that in our fascination with the similarities, too often we overlook the far more important differences between cultures. If a small world offers more opportunities for understanding each other better, it also offers more opportunities for grating on each other more.

As the richest and therefore the most-envied people in the world, we Americans

are particularly apt to touch raw nerves abroad unless we establish a two-way communication which makes us both understanding and understood.

This was underscored by *The Times* of London in commenting on the anti-Americanism encountered by Vice President Humphrey on his recent trip to Europe. Said *The Times*:

"The Americans are rich, strong and omnipresent. They make as much noise about their failures as about their successes. Their enormous capacity for coping and their energy leave the rest of the world breathless."

"Only a close contact with them reveals their idealism, their generosity, their intense sense of responsibility, their desire to do good, even if at great cost to themselves."

"Viewed from a distance they can far too often appear at once a ruthless machine and an uncoordinated agglomeration of self-seeking individuals. The sheer scale of American activity can be alarming to inhabitants of smaller and quieter countries."

I am not suggesting that American businesses and businessmen reduce their "capacity for coping" or their energies in order to smooth the way for better human understanding and expanded world trade. Those are qualities we need even more of, if anything. I do suggest the obvious: that part of the energy be devoted to adapting to the local customs and mores of the particular market in which we are competing. Harmonious trade relations will come from tolerance and adjustment, not from the homogenization of differing cultures and social structures.

Closely related to all this is a second obstacle to world trade and a second paradox of our times. The obstacle is nationalism, and the paradox is that the tide of nationalism has never run higher than in our age of internationalism.

It is a particularly unfortunate circumstance that, generally speaking, nationalistic fervor seems to run in inverse proportion to economic ability. The countries that most need the benefits of international trade and investment are frequently the most fearful of being dominated by foreign business or dependent on foreign goods.

This dilemma is not going to be resolved by doing away with nationalism. Nationalism is here to stay for a long time to come and we are going to have to live with it. The truth of the matter is that nationalism—which goes far beyond patriotism or sheer pride in country—gained one of its earliest footholds right here in the United States. As you Virginians know, the colonists were a pretty rambunctious group who guarded their hard-won independence fiercely.

In bringing today's nationalism and internationalism into accord, we need first of all to avoid the mistakes made by King George III, Lord North and their colleagues. In the British view of the time, the colonists seemed to have all the best of it. Britain provided a protected market for American exports and paid the duties on foreign produce flowing into the colonies. Even that tea that got dumped into the harbor up north was cheaper, tax included, than it was at home. But the British government's fatal mistake was failing to recognize that the colonies felt capable of managing their own affairs, and were unwilling to be managed for the benefit of the mother country.

Today's emerging nations feel the same way and, for starters, we need to convince them that neither their economic nor political independence is necessarily jeopardized by entanglements with foreign businesses; that on the contrary, foreign trade and investment are their best and perhaps only means of achieving the economic development that will assure continued political independence.

This is a trust that business must earn

by demonstration. We must make the best use of every available opportunity to prove that the self-interest of an international business is not to drain its host country but to help build it into a better market. The more often we succeed in contributing to the productivity and economic development of these countries, the more new opportunities will be opened to us.

It goes without saying that selling on the international market also requires buying on the international market. Nothing can be more axiomatic than the fact that world trade is a two-way street. And right here is the third basic reason for resistance to the free flow of goods across national borders—namely, the reluctance of existing industries and businesses to share their markets with newcomers. In theory, free competition is the heart and soul of free enterprise. In practice, the instinct for self-survival keeps businessmen from welcoming into their own markets competitors who are too successful.

When the successful competitor is a foreigner, the instinctive desire for protection is reinforced by nationalism and a dislike for foreign ways. This, again, is a two-way street—it is as true when an American industry succeeds abroad as when a foreign industry invades our domestic market. Naturally, therefore, there are always strong pressures for more protection.

On the other hand, it is always hard to reduce trade barriers because somebody always gets hurt, or at least is given a harder row to hoe. The benefits of free competition, great as they are, undeniably come at a cost.

As an example of how the wheel turns, Japanese businessmen—whose low production costs have been a traditional thorn in the side of U.S. business—are reported to be worrying over an influx of cheap products from less-developed countries, like rayon shirts from South Korea. The Koreans, with their lower wage rates, can sell the shirts at a dollar and a quarter where the comparable Japanese made product runs nearly five dollars.

Closer to home, the automotive trade agreement between Canada and the United States is incurring criticism on both sides of the border. Certainly, in its early life it has required numerous and often difficult adjustments by automotive manufacturers and their suppliers in both countries. But we believe it is working out to the best interests of all concerned—including car customers—through more efficient integration of the North American automotive industry. Given time, it will yield even greater benefits in strengthening Canada as a trading partner for the United States as well as stimulating a faster rate of growth in automotive sales and employment in our country and theirs.

All progress toward freer trade depends on the conviction that the overall benefits for the many will outweigh the costs and dislocations to the few. World trade is no place for the short-sighted view of short-range difficulties. The eventual result of mutually prospering trading partners is a greatly expanded market for the goods they want to sell each other.

Those of us who believe that a liberal trade policy is better than a protectionist policy have only one way to prove the strength of our conviction—by showing that we are willing to open our own markets to foreign competition.

At Ford Motor Company, for example, we want access to those fast-growing world markets I described earlier. We know we can do it only by giving foreign automobile manufacturers access to our own domestic market, and they are taking advantage of the opportunity to the extent of more than 600,000 cars a year.

As long ago as 1930, my grandfather spoke out against the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill in these words:

"Business thrives on competition. Nobody does his best if he knows no one is competing

with him . . . Instead of building up barriers to hinder the free flow of world trade, we should be seeking to tear existing barriers down. People cannot keep on buying from us unless we buy from them, and unless international trade can go on, our business will stagnate here at home."

The course of history since 1930 has confirmed this view. It is no time now to abandon the path toward freer trade that has brought us and the rest of the world so far.

This does not mean, of course, that we can knock down all our barriers at once. We can't give away the store. But it does mean that the United States must be willing to concede at least as much as it demands in return—and not be too meticulous in adding up the exact balance, especially in dealing with the nations who are still struggling for a firm foothold on the economic ladder.

International commerce is—or can be—a decisive influence in relieving world tensions and paving the way for a peaceful and fully prosperous planet. The United States must negotiate in a spirit which leaves no doubt of our determination to reach those goals through a freer and expanded world trade.

We cannot allow ourselves to be deterred from our larger aspirations for the sake of industries that might be placed at a competitive disadvantage. As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has observed, anti-dumping legislation must not be allowed to "impair the healthy expansion of trade or invite damaging retaliation by other countries." Neither, of course, should we expect particular industries to shoulder the entire burden of dislocations caused by our broader interests. Our internal policies should include provisions for helping affected industries adjust to their new conditions.

To pursue the liberal trade policies we and the world need, we must have the kind of grass roots business support that chambers of commerce can generate. The Virginia Trade Mission has laid a firm foundation for increasing Virginia's participation in world trade. I urge you all to continue your support of that effort.

BRITISH GUIDELINES CONTROL U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a desire for fairness toward the people of Rhodesia, to give them an opportunity to show their problems and aims are more like us in the United States than dislike prompt me to extend my remarks to include an analysis by Mr. J. H. Howman, Rhodesia's Minister of Information:

RHODESIA CORRECTS STATE SECRETARY PALMER

In an address given by the Hon. Joseph Palmer to the California Institute of Technology Faculty at Pasadena, California, on 28th February, 1967, the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs took the opportunity to make a virulent and biased attack upon the policies and principles of the Government and peoples of Rhodesia, and obviously sought to bring, not only the present Government of Rhodesia, but also its predecessors, into disrepute. His statement clearly indicated a most careful consideration of the circumstances and therefore presumably it reflects official State Department opinion. In the following analysis, Rhodesia's Minister of Information, the Hon. J. H. How-

man, corrects some of the inaccuracies in Mr. Palmer's address.

Mr. Palmer attempts to destroy the parallel between the American Declaration of Independence and the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence, and he starts off by commenting upon omissions in the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence of certain what he termed "ringing words contained in the American Declaration", namely, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Amongst these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Here, he says, is the heart of the difference—that such words were omitted from the Rhodesian Declaration. What he seems to be unaware of or to conveniently forget, is that these "truths" are incorporated in a constitution which has for a number of years existed in Rhodesia—that there was no necessity therefore, as there was at the time of the founding of the American independence, for an assertion of principles relating to the rights of men—for these principles had already been entrenched and incorporated as "declaration of rights" which forms part of the Constitution of Rhodesia and which remained incorporated in the Constitution upon its assumption of independence.

What is of greater moment, however, is that Mr. Palmer goes on to suggest that the Rhodesian case is a narrow one and that it constitutes an obstinate defense of narrow privilege, based upon racial bias and minority rule. Contrast with this, he says, the decisive difference between the American experience, where there has over the generations been bold imaginative and liberating influences and a "built-in dynamic for the achievement of the American promise". Thus, he points out, Jefferson crusaded for a more equitable distribution of land, the expansion of limited educational opportunities, the reform of the penal code, broadening of the franchise and the abolition of slavery.

FALSE SUGGESTIONS

Apparently he suggests that none of these principles have animated Rhodesia, either in the past or the present. But no more startling evidence of the falsity of the suggestion can be found if it is realized that the very occupation of this country by the white man led to the abolition of slavery—that the whole moving stream of Rhodesian policy for the past 75 years has been the creation of greater opportunities—the expansion of educational opportunities, the reform of the penal code, the broadening of the franchise—all these things have been part and parcel of Rhodesians and their way of life since they ever began. So that it is utterly untrue to suggest that the Rhodesian declaration charts no course for its people and seeks no creative progress.

Mr. Palmer goes on to examine in detail certain aspects of the situation in Rhodesia and he deals firstly with the Land Apportionment Act which he says divides the land roughly equally between the white and the African communities, despite disparity in numbers—that the acreage for the white minority consists of the best land, much of which lies unused—that he recalls when he lived in Rhodesia that the African population was required to destroy a part of its cattle wealth because the pasture land was overgrazed, meanwhile a white farmer was burning off his grazing land. Could you, he asks, look more deeply for a basic cause for discontent? What an utter misrepresentation of events!

Is he quite unaware that by the terms of our Constitution we set aside something like one half of the total acreage of land comprising Rhodesia for the African people—

for their sole and exclusive use. In doing so we have merely done rather more than what the American founders also did—set aside a certain proportion of the land in order to preserve to the indigenous people the opportunity to continue their traditional style of living, free from incursion or intrusion by persons of any other race. Had we not done so for very humanitarian reasons, the African people might well have been without any land whatsoever.

Precisely this policy was followed by founders of America. The Indian reservations were created and are to this day maintained for basically the same reason as that which animates the people of Rhodesia. But does the American Government, for instance, set aside a proportionate acreage of its land for occupation by its Negro population or its Indian population or for that matter for occupation by any particular race? Is not the cardinal basis for the use of land its best use in the national interest? No country can afford to set aside an ever-increasing proportion of its land without regard for the return to be derived from that land, and one of the major problems in Africa is not to make more land available for the African people, but to ensure that that land is adequately and properly used and brought into productive operation.

The fact that it became necessary to reduce the cattle population held by the Africans was because basically cattle represent prestige symbols—status symbols—they are not used in the economic interests of the nation as a whole. What possible future could there be for a country which merely set aside further and further acreages of land without regard for the preservation of the soil which over-stocking drastically destroys.

To condemn a white farmer for burning off his surplus grazing displays only ignorance. To anyone familiar with the problem, this is merely good farming practice. It has been recognized for a long time that it is essential from time to time to burn off the surplus grasses in order to permit the growth of new grasses which are so necessary for animal life. Could anyone see a more basic cause for gross misrepresentation of a situation?

LAND

The Land Apportionment Act has been used by our critics to castigate the white man and to prove his intransigence in giving the African a "square deal," but it must be remembered that in 1920 a British Order in Council stated that the land assigned to Africans as reserves "shall be secured for the sole and exclusive use and occupation of natives and that this assignment of land shall, subject to the provisions of this order, be taken to be a final assignment to the natives inhabiting Southern Rhodesia. . . ."

In 1925 a Land Commission was set up under Sir Morris Carter, a former Chief Justice of Uganda and Tanganyika. In order to meet the situation as viewed by Carter, the proposals of his Commission were adopted resulting in a division of the land as follows:

	Acre
Areas for future determination	17,793,300
Native Reserves	21,594,957
Matopo National Park	224,000
Mission lands	406,200
Urban areas	149,033
Forest areas	670,000
Native Purchase Areas	6,851,876
Semi-neutral areas	80,329
Land alienated to Europeans	31,033,050
Remainder (available to Europeans)	17,423,815

On the basis of the recommendations, out of a total of just over 96 million acres: the European areas would amount to 48,605,896 acres; the Native areas would amount to 28,933,362 acres; the undetermined areas would amount to 17,793,300 acres.

Today the position is:

Total Tribal Trust Land (African) -----	Acres 40, 123, 200
Native Purchase Areas (African) -----	4, 279, 500
Unreserved Land (all races—including 779,993 acres of titled land held by Europeans voluntarily transferred to that area since provision was made to do so in the amendment of August, 1961) -----	5, 878, 900
National Land, i.e. National Parks, Game Reserves, etc.	10, 524, 800
European Land (this includes African townships where these fall in European areas) -----	35, 713, 100

Quite clearly the picture portrayed by these figures shows that successive governments have been very liberal in their re-portionment of land and they cannot be criticized for entrenching the rights of the European under the Land Apportionment Act—quite the opposite has been the attitude.

Over and above this, it should be well noted that the so-called "European Area" is populated by far more Africans than Europeans, so it is quite wrong to visualize the European area as land set aside solely for white usage, whereas the Tribal Areas provide for the sole use and occupation by Africans.

EDUCATION

Mr. Palmer's next attack is on education policy and here he says that Rhodesia spends equal amounts on the education of white children and African children although the latter greatly outnumbers the former; that upper secondary and college education is available to more whites than Africans; that although a higher proportion of Africans receive education in Rhodesia than in African-controlled countries, the fact remains that relatively few Africans are permitted facilities to complete the highest secondary grade or to go to college—"they are trained for a place in a society determined by the ruling minority, not by themselves". He then draws on statistics, the effect of which shows disparity in that there are a greater number of African schoolchildren than white children in primary school, yet there were a lesser number of African children than white children in secondary school. Thus, he says, only 2½ per cent of the African children continue to receive elementary to secondary schooling as compared with 62½ per cent of white children. Nor, he suggests, does this tell the whole story, since many white children are educated outside the country. These he describes as "circumscribed educational opportunities and obviously designed to the political expression in a country where the franchise is severely limited on the basis of property, wages and educational qualifications". Thus the direction of the Rhodesian governments he says became increasingly oppressive and racially motivated. All this, of course, is no more or less than a gross distortion and indeed almost an obscene libel on the people of Rhodesia. Let us look, therefore, at this problem of education in rather more detail than the somewhat superficial analysis of Mr. Palmer.

Three features of the educational system of Rhodesia are often commented upon, as alleged discrimination between Europeans or whites on the one hand and Africans on the other and it is necessary to understand them clearly and concisely. They are—

(a) that European education is compulsory up to the age of 15, whereas African education is not;

(b) European primary education is provided by the State whereas African primary education is largely in the hands of Missions, and policy is to the effect that this will progressively become a responsibility of local government;

(c) there is a gross disparity between per

capita State expenditure on European primary school and African education.

We have stated the distinctions or the discriminations as they are alleged to be. Let us now explain and justify them. If, of course, one is a believer, as Mr. Palmer obviously is, that Africa is a place that should be inhabited by blacks and that a person of a white skin has no part to play, then the explanation will fall on deaf ears, but if, as the people of Rhodesia believe, they not only have a right to be here historically and for other causes, but their removal would be the grossest betrayal of progressive responsible development in Africa, then the explanation will be understood and accepted. It is this basic difference in approach that underlines the whole issue.

The justification for compulsory education is that it is the ideal and that in the long term there should be an increasing measure of compulsion for all children regardless of race. So far as the white man is concerned, he has been long accustomed to compulsory education. It is a part of his way of life and prosecution for failure to comply is extremely rare. To depart from this target would mean a serious lowering of accepted standards and for the African a lowering of targets. It is an example to which one hopes the African will aspire and a retreat would mean a serious backward step with dire consequences for all.

It is only since the last war that a massive demand for education manifested itself amongst Africans. Before that time, many decades were spent in trying to persuade the African of the value of education and to encourage his attendance at school. There are still large numbers steeped in this frame of mind and to apply compulsory attendance to such people or to four out of every 10 pupils who at present drop out before reaching Standard 4 would be a harsh, unwelcome and indeed an inexplicable penalty as well as a complete disruption of the traditional African way of life. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful if "education" under such compulsive conditions would be absorbed. Furthermore, of course, the disproportionate cost of enforcement would leave far less funds available for those who sought to be educated.

DELIBERATE POLICY

Therefore as a matter of deliberate policy, education for the whites remains compulsory while education for the black continues to be voluntary. However, as the Africans establish and take a more effective and responsible part in local government and which itself assumes a greater responsibility for education, then they will be at liberty to introduce compulsion by the application of local by-laws.

On the second criticism, it must be remembered that primary education for the Europeans has from its inception been provided by the State. It must be appreciated that educationists, particularly teachers, are emphatically opposed to any transfer from Government to local authority service. In view of the world demand for teachers, any obduracy on the part of Government in refusing to take note of their views might well lead to an exodus of teachers which, in view of the world demand, would leave Rhodesia poorer for any change.

This apart however, it is a basic fact that pupils in primary schools are drawn from all over the country and that the schools are, for the main part, of a national rather than a provincial or communal nature. European rural areas were sparsely populated, with vast tracts in which there were no primary schools. Therefore the children were either accepted at boarding schools, or in the case of younger ones, enrolled in national correspondence schools where parents supervised the curriculum. Such schools were for the most part brought into being having regard to a healthy environment or to such

fortuitous reasons as the availability of former military or other camps which were left over from the last war. Furthermore, a high degree of pupil migration is a constant problem to the educational authorities. Figures of pupil withdrawals and admissions in a year reveal a turnover sometimes as high as 40%. This arises by reason of migration of parents from one center to another, with boarders tending to migrate less than day scholars. With the existing educational system, teachers can be moved with changes of population and to meet demand in a necessarily growing and developing country. Anyone familiar with Rhodesia will be aware, for instance, of the enormous development which has taken place in areas which a matter of five or 10 years ago, had been regarded as almost uninhabitable because of the prevalence of heat, disease, and the lack of water—a position revolutionized by the introduction of irrigation. All this means a change of population and the necessity therefore of a central government system of education that enables the position to be met.

Contrast, on the other hand, African primary education. Here by reason of the development of the country, the school is virtually a community institution, built by the local people as an expression of their interest in education or as happened in early days, as a prestige symbol and it serves only the children living within walking distance. The comparatively dense population meant that boarding facilities are not in such urgent demand and indeed a three-mile limit had to be imposed to prevent unnecessary duplication or overlapping caused by the evangelizing zeal of the missions. Peasant life is a fairly stable life and there was little of the pupil migration so characteristic of parents employed by railways, mines, churches, government, business and individual concerns.

In a highly complex technological and competitive society with a cash economy, there may be some justification for claiming that primary education is a right of the people and not a privilege. Without it a person could not live, but in a subsistence peasant economy and mode of life, education has not got this indispensable quality and the development of education must go hand in hand or slightly in advance of the development of the community and its productivity.

A noted Commission (appointed, incidentally, by the predecessors of the present Government of Rhodesia) which investigated this problem of education, expressed it thus—"policy must be to encourage an attitude of mind so that they (the African) will readily recognize their responsibilities and accept opportunity to participate actively and imaginatively in programmes to add to their amenities and increase their productivity. It is in the field of education that this conscious involvement finds a ready expression". The Commission went on to urge that the future of primary schools must be regarded as a matter for the people, adequately supported by central government grants.

The position of the African in urban areas is, of course, very different. Here the economic environment approximates to that of the European. The traditional economic system and the subsistence mentality which goes with it is changing, and this being the case, African education in urban areas is and has at all material times, like European education, been regarded as a function of the central government.

FINANCE

The third line of attack is on the disparity of costs, and this, of course, was a feature which Mr. Palmer delightedly highlighted. On the face of it, the disparity is of course particularly easy to attack. Thirty-three thousand pupils in one system cost £2½ million in 1965/66—647,000 pupils in another

system cost £4.8 million, a per capita ratio in one case of £75.7 and in the other £7.5.

Boarding costs inflate the per capita figure of the European education but the facts are that £59.1 per annum is the cost to the government of a white pupil and £13.8 of a black urban pupil and £6.8 of a rural African, leaving out of account all overheads, headquarters, capital and boarding costs.

This disparity of costs must be appreciated in this context—

(a) the European system is a fully developed one of a standard comparable with that available in England, Australia, Canada, or the United States and without it, no European will come to or remain in Rhodesia without educational opportunities for his children comparable to that which he can receive elsewhere. In order to maintain the economy and the professional standards, Rhodesian education practice must move forward and keep pace with these more developed countries. It is no answer to destroy one system for the theoretical principle of equality;

(b) African primary education is as we have indicated, an emerging and developing system. The first aim was to achieve vernacular literacy, a rudimentary command of spoken and written English and simple arithmetic—functional literacy for a modern social and economic environment, urban or rural. The standards of teachers to cope with this rudimentary education have been raised over the years. In 1928 the average African teacher was educated to standard I or 2, but in 1936 it was standard IV—Standard VI in 1939, Primary Teacher (Lower) in 1947, Primary Teacher (Higher) in 1950. It is continually being improved. The rates of pay of teachers of humble level are much lower than those teachers of standard qualification, and it is the salary of these latter teachers that accounts for almost 70 per cent of the expenditure on European primary education.

Mr. Palmer seems to be one of those theorists whose conception of social justice is an equal sharing-out of the financial resources regardless of the consequences. This being so he might consider the overall effects of an equal sharing-out of the financial resources upon the educational system in Rhodesia. If the total financial resources available for education were shared out on a per capita basis equally between the European and African population of Rhodesia, the amount available would be £10 7s. per pupil. In fact, it would give no significant improvement in the level of African tuition and it would utterly destroy the European system. This would mean a lowering of standards rather than an improvement which African education is aiming at, and it would certainly not leave any funds available for secondary or university education. Put another way, if the African pupil were allocated a per capita cost equal to that of the European pupil, then African primary education alone would cost £38.2 million per annum in a country whose total estimated revenue is £74 million. However much nationalists, extremists or Mr. Palmer himself might urge, this is utterly impracticable. It will be remembered that the oil revenues of Iraq were used for just such a purpose when schools were built to meet political pressures and then stood empty.

Whether we like it or not, even now in Rhodesia four out of 10 pupils do not go beyond vernacular literacy because they do not wish to.

Extending far beyond all this is the fact that of the African population in Rhodesia approximately one half is under the age of 17 years so that in effect there is one adult paying taxes or fees to sustain the education and health and other costs of a child, whereas in Britain and indeed in the United States, there are three adults to sustain the upbringing of each child. What is more, in these developed countries the adults are highly productive and cannot be compared

with the dominant subsistence mentality of the African adult. The heavy drag of a subsistence peasant population largely content just to feed itself and to enjoy its leisure, contributes extremely little to the economy. This is an enormous problem bearing on the financial resources of the country to provide the resources available for African education.

This peasant sector draws off large funds devoted to development and extension services which have been established to induce them to change their mode of life. And all this has been developed and attempted in a country in which the white man has sought to help the African to advance in a myriad of ways without begging one penny from either Britain, United States or any other country.

PROUD RECORD

We have reason to be proud that we have achieved a quality of education from primary schools to university which, apart from the Republic of South Africa, is the best in Africa and that the percentage of Africans being educated in Rhodesia is easily the highest. We have done this out of our own resources, out of our own savings and we have not had one penny piece in support—compared with the £150 million that has been paid to African régimes in countries to the north of us. Even with the assistance of these millions of pounds, the armies of experts and magnificent plans developed by the United Nations and other advanced nations, no country in Africa has yet found the means to bridge or check the widening gap between the developed and undeveloped societies and at the same time promote sustained economic growth.

On this aspect, let it be stressed that at full secondary level the systems of education in Rhodesia are entirely equated. Once the pupil has reached the top of the primary school system, he moves into a field where such "discrimination" as is alleged falls entirely away. Comparative tuition costs are £101.3 per European pupil and £81.1 per African pupil. Against this the European pupil pays £24 or nearly 25 per cent of this cost in fees, whilst the African pupil pays £9 or approximately 11 per cent.

Above this, at university level we have discrimination in reverse. For it has been the practice for many years in Rhodesia's urgent endeavor to raise the standards of its people, that every African pupil leaving school who has acquired the necessary qualifications to enable him to enter university and who wishes to do so, has been assisted to the full extent by the full cost of his courses. In contrast, in the European, Asian and Coloured field, the award of scholarships and grants is highly competitive and only the very best of the scholarship candidates receive assistance at this level. Is it to be wondered at that Mr. Palmer's slighting references to all that we have sought to achieve in this country over the years can, at the best, be described as an obscene libel?

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Lastly, Mr. Palmer goes on to cast doubts upon the *bona fides* of our attitudes by suggesting that we do not favour a multi-racial society or majority rule or accept full integration. Naturally enough, Rhodesians are chary of expressions such as "a multi-racial society" with all the connotations which modern parlance tends to give to it, but there is no Rhodesian alive who does not recognize that we live in a country with a plurality of racial societies and it is necessary to create and preserve conditions so that all peoples can flourish and progress. It is true that we have grave reservations about "majority rule" meaning black rule and blatant racialism. Have we not good reason? The policy of Rhodesians has been consistent, namely that it accepts that all persons can advance according to merit, ability and competence and if these be the criteria then they alone should determine in whose hands

government should be established. To argue that those hands should necessarily be black because they are in the majority and irrespective of the competence and ability of the persons concerned is a travesty of democracy. To suggest that unless full integration is accepted as a national policy then that country is doomed or reactionary is also a travesty. Problems of race and culture contact are world-wide and have no more been resolved in Rhodesia than they have in America and other countries in the world, but it is abundantly clear that racial prejudice and consequential friction is a feature of human society which should be avoided at all possible costs and it is certainly not relieved, avoided or overcome by a policy of forced social integration.

Never has Rhodesia experienced, for instance, the bitter race riots such as those which occurred in Los Angeles and never have our soldiers been called upon to intervene in the wholesale fashion that was required to quell that revolt, for revolt it was—the Negro black power movement against domination by the whites.

FRANCHISE

Consistent policies in Rhodesia have held to a qualitative franchise on the grounds that persons who have a moderate educational achievement have presumably acquired the qualities of mind, sufficiently trained and disciplined to enable them to judge the policies of political parties; that if they earn a moderate income or have property of a reasonable value, then they must at least have moved beyond the subsistence level and be making a contribution to the national good. It is on the basis of ensuring that those who exercise the vote have adequate knowledge of what is implied, that has governed political thinking in this country. Is it not time for people like Mr. Palmer to pause and consider whether the ideologies that they would pursue in the United States, which may or may not have been followed elsewhere, are necessarily good for all other countries. Unless and until they are satisfied that this be so, they should desist from imposing their will upon other countries—upon other states who have a very real conception of the problems facing them, who make no claim to infallibility, who recognize their weaknesses and the weaknesses of human nature in particular, but who seek above all to create a country in which all men can live in dignity and community of purpose and take their place amongst the community of nations as a whole.

For these reasons, Rhodesians oppose the policies of the State Department toward them, and find it difficult to understand how the State Department can continue to be so ill-advised as to follow blindly British policies aimed against a true and natural right to independence which Rhodesians share in common with the peoples of the United States.

It is shocking indeed that Mr. Palmer should, in his attitudes, show himself to be subservient to a British sovereignty which seeks to continue to keep an unwarrantable jurisdiction over people who no longer are content to be treated as children, but who demand and have assumed the right to resolve their own problems in their own way within their own borders. If Rhodesians go wrong, the consequences will be severe and they will have to bear them. If Mr. Palmer is wrong, Rhodesians will likewise have to bear the consequences. One hopes that he may come to realize that he is not necessarily and infallibly right.

THE JOHNSON DOCTRINE

Perhaps, however, Rhodesians can take comfort in the remarks said to have been made by President Johnson during a recent visit to Asia when he explained his Government's policy as: "to help other people make modern societies, but societies true to their

own traditions, their own culture, and their own ambitions. There will be growing pains of diversity, but from them will emerge mutual progress that does not ask of any of us to surrender our most vital principles."

Such comments show a deepening awareness of human relations. Who knows but a Presidential understanding may yet come to cast a light upon our affairs?

"THE PRESIDENT I NOW KNOW"

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, recently some of my constituents had the opportunity to visit Washington and learn how our Government operates. The highlights of the day was a meeting with President Johnson.

Miss Helen Bloom, who is a reporter for the Times Herald Record, of Middletown, N.Y., was there while the President answered the questions put to him by ordinary American citizens who are concerned about the world they live in. Miss Bloom's article, "The President I Now Know," which was printed on the front page of the newspaper, revealed in simple and touching terms her reactions to this meeting with the President.

I am inserting this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Americans can know the reaction of one American reporter meeting and speaking with her President:

THE PRESIDENT I NOW KNOW

(By Helen Bloom)

I visited President Johnson Thursday, and I was impressed.

Not by the White House, for I'd been inside its offices several times before. And not by shaking the Chief Executive's hand, because to me one handshake is like any other.

I was impressed by the man and the way he spoke—not at you, but to you—as if he were saying: "It's your country as much as mine, and you have the right to ask for explanations about what I am doing with it and why I choose the way I do."

I entered the side entrance to the White House with 29 other members of the region's press led by Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D. 28, who had invited us to the Capital that day to learn more about national government.

Our appointment with Johnson was scheduled for 6 p.m., but we had to wait 30 minutes because the President was closeted with General William C. Westmoreland, commander of allied forces in Vietnam.

I wasn't that excited about the appointment. I had seen President Johnson at the White House several times before during media conferences, and I doubted whether Thursday's meeting would be more than a lot of "hellos" and 30 quick handshakes and smiles.

During the wait, two presidential aides repeatedly explained that our conference with the nation's leader would be entirely off the record. We would not be allowed to disclose the topics the President covered, nor what he said, because Johnson wanted to feel free to say what he pleased and speak "off the cuff," they said.

At 6:30 the aides ushered us into the cabinet room with its long table and big black leather chairs, each bearing a plaque on its back to signify the cabinet member who sits in it.

Resnick took the seat to the right of the President's empty chair, and motioned me to take the one beside him.

In a few minutes, President Johnson entered the room, surrounded by Secret Service men. He went around the table shaking everyone's hand, as I expected.

Then he sat in the huge chair designated for him, and welcomed us to the Capital and his home.

He explained once again that the meeting was to be off the record because he had not expected to hold a press conference and just wanted to talk with us.

Then the President opened himself to questions, and he got five of them. They were not easy. Resnick flinched noticeably when I asked mine.

But the President did not react angrily, and he did not rush his answers, as I expected him to do.

He considered each question carefully and took a great deal of time to painstakingly explain his positions, thoughts and feelings. The meeting everyone had expected to last 10 minutes, took one hour.

As the President spoke, he looked directly at the questioner. The sagging cheeks and deep worry creases in his face seemed to recede as his pointed features and dark olive eyes reached out.

He was the President of the United States; he was commander and chief of the U.S. Armed Forces; he was husband, father, fellow citizen, and fellow human being. All sides of the man appeared as he answered the questions.

His voice grew in intensity and volume, as he took pains to describe what he is doing. His hands moved with the rises and falls of his voice.

And I thought to myself, this man, this President of the United States, whom so many people refuse to believe, is being very honest with us.

He said nothing different than he has said before, but he was saying it directly to us, with no interception by the White House press corps, and he was saying it simply: "Man to man."

The side of Johnson that people term "wheelerdealer" was not in the cabinet room during that hour. At least, I didn't see it, and I was looking for it.

Instead, I saw a man who is very conscious of the 190 million Americans, whose lives are affected by his every word and action.

Watching him painstakingly answering our questions, I thought to myself, that tall, tanned man does not sit in his oval office for Lyndon Baines Johnson alone. He is there for the 190 million Americans.

I looked at his expensive, finely tailored gray suit and thought President Johnson does not need Project Headstart, the Teacher Corps, Medicare, Social Security benefits, urban planning, and all the other programs his administration proposes.

He does not need to deepen the creases in his brow over crime in New York City, pollution of the Hudson River, tornadoes in Illinois, or loans to college students all over the country.

But the 190 million Americans need these programs and they need someone to crease his brow to get them.

Watching President Johnson Thursday evening, I could not help but think to myself, whatever political and psychological ambitions put that tall man in the leader's chair, the overriding reason he is there is that he cares what happens to me, to my family, the people at the cabinet table, and everybody else in this nation.

I went into the cabinet room a severe victim of "the credibility gap."

By the time I left, President Johnson had bridged it.

As I trod the deep, rich red carpets from the office to the door, I wished to myself that everyone I know could sit with the President the way I had just done, asking him about

the policies that perturb them, and having him explain his actions without worrying about glaring television lights, microphones, and popping flash bulbs.

If they could, perhaps "the credibility gap" would be no bigger than a crack in the sidewalk.

A BILL TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR THE CREATION OF NEW OR EXPANDING JOB-PRODUCING INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BLANTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will provide incentives for the creation of new or expanding job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes. Rural America has many problems. Most of these, in my opinion, can be solved by job-producing industries located in areas of low income and high unemployment. The decline of jobs in rural areas has caused a forced migration of ill-prepared people to the cities, resulting in transfer of poverty from rural America to city slums. As a result, the cities have high social costs, poverty pockets, and congestion in housing and transportation. A dollar of public expenditure to encourage businessmen to provide jobs in areas of rural and urban poverty might save more than a dollar in social costs in these areas. This great exodus to the cities has got to be reversed. The only possible way is to create jobs at home.

The 1960 rural people comprised about 30 percent of the Nation's population. If we use the \$3,000 income level as the poverty line, we find that 46 percent of the families with incomes below this level lived in rural areas. About 16 percent of this 46 percent rural aggregate was accounted for by families living on farms. In 1964, farm families comprised 6.5 percent of all families in the Nation. It is estimated that they accounted, as in 1960, for 16 percent of all families having incomes of less than \$3,000 per year. While there have been several programs since 1950 in an effort to aid in rural development, they have not been successful. Programs such as investment loans, technical, and other assistance from the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; the various manpower training programs; the expanded loan authority of the Farmers Home Administration for water facilities, nonfarm business capital, and recreational enterprise; improved educational facilities encouraged by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and by enlarged authorization for vocational education; and many other programs have failed to substantially improve the economic plight of rural America.

One excellent example is that the Economic Development Administration of

the Department of Commerce has informed me on several occasions that they cannot award grants to communities under 2,500 population or give a high priority on the waiting list to any community that is not presently acquiring an industry. We are failing to get at the problem, the problem being that we need industry in rural America.

This bill will give a 14-percent tax credit to qualifying industry that expands or opens a new facility. The 14-percent credit will be acknowledged up to \$50,000 and 50 percent of that portion of the 14 percent remaining after the \$50,000 is deducted.

It is not the purpose of this bill to give tax credits. The purpose of this bill is to get new and expanded industry in rural America, in general, and in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee, in particular.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AWARDS THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO PETER S. CONNOR OF SOUTH ORANGE, N.J.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President of the United States awarded the highest medal this Nation can bestow on one of its fighting men—the Medal of Honor.

For me there was great significance in that event, because the young man so honored, posthumously, was S. Sgt. Peter S. Connor of New Jersey, a resident of my own congressional district.

With our President we mourn the loss of this young man to his family, his friends, and his country. He died for his buddies and for his beliefs.

This young man represents the valor of the American soldier in Vietnam. He represents the American commitment in Vietnam. He represents that "time of testing" which President Johnson spoke about as he awarded the medal to the bereaved family.

We are relearning lessons in Vietnam every day—that no nation or people can be secure when aggression is ignored; that those who can resist aggression bear the heaviest responsibility to do so; that resistance cannot be made without pain and sacrifice.

These are the lessons we must take to heart. This is why Sgt. Peter Connor died.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the remarks of President Johnson on the occasion of the award of the Medal of Honor to S. Sgt. Peter S. Connor, and the citation as read by Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE MEDAL OF HONOR CEREMONY (POSTHUMOUSLY) FOR S. SGT. PETER S. CONNOR, THE ROSE GARDEN, THE WHITE HOUSE, MAY 2, 1967

Mrs. Connor and members of the Connor family, Secretary Nitze, Members of the Cabinet, Members of Congress, distinguished

businessmen, distinguished labor leaders, ladies and gentlemen, once again we meet to honor the memory and the name of a very brave man.

For his family, and for his comrades in arms, his memory is imperishably alive.

For his fellow Americans, his name has joined those who also gave the highest measure of manhood to the land that they love: "Who gave their lives in acts of selfless courage, so that others might live."

Peter Connor, Staff Sergeant of the United States Marine Corps, was mortally wounded in Quang Ngai province, Vietnam, on February 25 of last year.

He was the platoon sergeant of a unit moving forward under enemy fire. Preparing to charge an enemy emplacement with a grenade, he discovered that it was defective. It would explode in a matter of seconds—long before he could get close enough to use it on the target.

His men were dispersed all about him. If he threw the grenade in any direction, it would kill or wound some of his men.

He had only a moment to make a decision. But in that moment, the values of centuries and the training of years, came to bear upon him.

He held the grenade against his own body. He absorbed its terrible violence in himself. He spared the lives of all of his men.

Eleven days later he died of his wounds. Who among us would have done the same?

We say, and we believe, that the lives of many outweigh one life. That is the teaching of the prophets and philosophers; it is at the heart of our democratic faith, and of our religion. But at the moment of testing, when the decision between life and death rests in the palm of the hand, who can say with confidence that he would hear that teaching, and respond to that faith?

There are men in Vietnam at this hour who do say it and can say it. Like Peter Connor, they have accepted the primacy of those ancient values. Selfless valor has become as much a part of them as the blood and bone of which they are made. They are prepared to sacrifice, not because they love life any less than the rest of us do, but because they treasure, even more, what gives it meaning—the power to rise above self for their brothers' sake.

Sergeant Connor died at a time of testing, not only for himself, but for the land that he knew and loved. Thousands of miles away from the battlefield on which he fell, his countrymen debate the course of the war he fought in.

Many of them are genuinely concerned to find the wisest course for their country. Some of them have never learned, or have forgotten, the lessons of this country.

That no nation or people can be secure when aggression is ignored;

That those who can resist aggression bear the heaviest responsibility to do so;

That resistance cannot be made without pain and without loss and without great sacrifice;

But that the cost of ignoring the aggressor is to the integrity—and to the soul—of a whole people.

The debate will go on—so long as we are a democracy, so long as men like Peter Connor shoulder their packs and face—not hostile placards and debating points—but the bullets and mortar shells of marching aggressive armies. The debate will go on, and it will have its price. It is a price our democracy must be prepared to pay, and that the angriest voices of dissent should be prepared to acknowledge.

We give thanks for our freedom—and for the brave and selfless men who have preserved that freedom for us for two centuries or more.

To them be honor and praise. To us is the responsibility for redeeming their sacrifice. And though the bravery of Peter Connor is

beyond most of us, it was built on a faith that we share with him; and we can see, in his example, something of what we might be ourselves.

Mrs. Connor, in sorrow, and in pride, I present this nation's highest award for valor. It is awarded posthumously, in the name of the Congress of the United States, to your gallant husband—Staff Sergeant Peter S. Connor, of the United States Marines.

Secretary Nitze will now read the citation.

Secretary NITZE. The President of the United States takes pride in presenting the Medal of Honor posthumously to Staff Sergeant Peter S. Connor, United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against enemy Viet Cong forces at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as Platoon Sergeant of the Third Platoon, Company F, Second Battalion, Third Marines, First Marine Division (Reinforced), Fleet Marine Force, in Quang Ngai Province, Republic of Vietnam on 25 February 1966. Leading his platoon on a search and destroy operation in an area made particularly hazardous by extensive cave and tunnel complexes, Sergeant Connor maneuvered his unit aggressively forward under intermittent enemy small-arms fire. Exhibiting particular alertness and keen observation, he spotted an enemy spider hole emplacement approximately fifteen meters to his front. He pulled the pin from a fragmentation grenade intending to charge the hole boldly and drop the missile into its depths. Upon pulling the pin he realized that the firing mechanism was faulty, and that even as he held the safety device firmly in place, the fuse charge was already activated. With only precious seconds to decide, he further realized that he could not cover the distance to the small opening of the spider hole in sufficient time, and that to hurl the deadly bomb in any direction would result in death or injury to some of his comrades tactically deployed near him. Manifesting extraordinary gallantry and with utter disregard for his personal safety, he chose to hold the grenade against his own body in order to absorb the terrific explosion and spare his comrades. His act of extreme valor and selflessness in the face of virtually certain death, although leaving him mortally wounded, spared many of his fellow Marines from death or injury. His gallant action in giving his life in the cause of freedom reflects the highest credit upon the Marine Corps and the Armed Forces of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of steel imports has lately become very pronounced in all economic discussions. The domestic steel industry is now feeling the gradual impact of foreign steel, and has appealed to the Congress for assistance.

I will not now discuss the pertinent facts of the problem, because I have often done so and will again in the future. I will say, however, that representatives of the industry will testify at hearings being held by my labor subcommittee on the impact of foreign imports on American employment. They will appear on

Thursday, May 18, and I hope many Members will be present to hear another tale of woe by an American industry injured by low-wage foreign competition. In this case, however, that industry happens to be among the most fundamental to our economic health.

I commend the following resolution of the Senate of Pennsylvania to the attention of my colleagues. Quite obviously, the steel industry and the labor it employs are vital to Pennsylvania.

RESOLUTION BY THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas, Imports of foreign steel have increased from more than one million tons in 1957 to eleven million tons in 1966; and

Whereas, In 1966 these imports accounted for eleven per cent of the total domestic steel market; and

Whereas, The current world excess steel producing capacity of approximately seventy-five million tons and projected facility additions for Western Europe and Japan indicate that imports will account for an increasingly greater share of the domestic steel market in the years to come; and

Whereas, The current high level of importation is largely due to the many actions of foreign governments to encourage their steel industries to export, coupled with the significantly lower employment costs in those countries; and

Whereas, If present trends continue, the loss of volume caused by the rapidly increasing imports will pose a serious threat to the profitability of the steel industry; and

Whereas, A healthy domestic steel industry is vital to our National security, is instrumental in maintaining a high level of employment in Pennsylvania and other steel producing states, and it is a significant factor in stemming the drain on the United States balance of payments; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the United States Congress to take all necessary steps to provide the domestic steel industry with temporary relief from the increasing inflow of foreign steel imports until equitable and fair competition is established; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania and to each member of the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary.

AMERICAN INDIAN CHILDREN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, American Indian children are among the most disadvantaged in our Nation. The Congress recognized this last year when we were considering amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. In order to assure that Indian children are reached by educational programs that are vital to their future, and for many other reasons of merit, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7819, the committee-reported bill which includes provision for Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

There is currently much discussion of the so-called Quie substitute, H.R. 8983. This bill does not make provision for the participation of Indian children in schools conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the block grant programs proposed for fiscal year 1969. The educational results of this omission could be tragic. Actually, nothing in the proposed H.R. 8983 or in the so-called laundry list of things that the States could use the funds for, indicates any awareness of the educational needs of Indian children on reservations.

The heart of the question here is this: Will we exclude some of the Nation's neediest children under the guise of attempting to "reduce the amount of paperwork, justifications and negotiation" or lose the opportunity to serve this neglected segment of the public while proclaiming it to be our legislative intent to be "broad, rather than narrow" in our interpretations? All of us abhor paperwork. All of us seek quick, easy, and broad approaches to our national problems. But not, I submit, at the price of needy children.

In considering this legislation there is an opportunity for dialogue, discussion, and contemplation. To assist in this process I urge my colleagues to consider the following:

In fiscal year 1965, there were 134,064 Indian students between the ages of 6 and 18 enrolled in schools—public, Federal, private, and mission schools. More than half of all Indian children of school age were attending public schools; they were eligible to participate in Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs conducted by their local educational agencies. But those enrolled in Federal—Bureau of Indian Affairs—schools were ineligible to participate in special programs for the educationally disadvantaged under Elementary and Secondary Education Act as it was originally enacted. We corrected this inequity last year by adding a special provision assuring participation of children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior. Here are just a few of the justifications for including these children:

Approximately two-thirds of the Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools come from families with an annual income of less than \$2,000.

A majority of these children enter school speaking no English or, at best, limited English.

Of those Indian children who attend school—nearly 16,000 do not—50 percent drop out before they complete the 12th grade.

On the reservations, young adults—those under 45 years of age—average an eighth grade education, compared to a national average of almost 12 years of school.

Lack of education breeds poverty; chronic unemployment on reservations runs six or seven times higher than the national average, and the average income for reservation dwellers is one-third to one-fourth the national average.

For all of the reasons set forth, I urge my colleagues to reject the Quie substitute, H.R. 8983, and to support H.R. 7819, the committee-approved bill.

**AMERICAN EXCHANGE STUDENTS
LEAD IN FLAG BURNING**

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRINKLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. P. E. Gallagher, retired, of Columbus, Ga., has brought to my attention a newspaper article which appeared in the May 1, 1967, Columbus Enquirer newspaper. I was shocked and dismayed to learn that a few American exchange students apparently organized and led anti-United States demonstrations in Madrid, Spain, in which four U.S. flags were burned.

Mr. Speaker, such students do not represent the feelings of the vast majority of American youth, and they should not be sent abroad as representatives of this great Nation. The exchange student program has been very successful and it is most regrettable that a few misguided individuals have acted in such a manner as to bring discredit on such a worthy program.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Department of State to determine which American exchange students were involved in these demonstrations, and if they are receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Government, such assistance should be terminated immediately.

I am inserting the newspaper article in the RECORD, in the hope that all of my colleagues will read it.

**ABOUT 1,500 MADRID STUDENTS BURN FOUR
U.S. FLAGS**

MADRID, SPAIN.—In wild anti-American demonstrations, about 1,500 Madrid University students have burned four U.S. flags and caricatures of President Johnson on the campus.

They denounced U.S. involvement in Vietnam, waved North Vietnamese flags, and chanted "Yankee go home." Among them were some U.S. exchange students. Then protest squads moved into downtown Madrid and to the U.S. Embassy.

Security police ringing the embassy chased away about 100 students, who were pursued by foot and jeeps into wide streets and scattered again when they tried to reform. Some students were heard singing the U.S. civil rights hymn "We Shall Overcome."

Spanish officials said students, including a pro-Communist Chinese group, had helped to organize the demonstrations. They also blamed U.S. students.

Immediately after the burning incidents, university Rector Enrrique Gutierrez Trios phoned U.S. Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke to apologize for what he called "this most regretful incident on our campus."

His action apparently headed off a formal U.S. protest to the foreign ministry against the insults to the flag and the President.

Spanish officials were quick to place some blame on U.S. exchange students at the sprawling university, which has more than 25,000 regular students and half as many special students, for the sudden wave of criticism of U.S. participation in the Vietnamese war and support for Communist North Vietnam.

They pointed out that for more than two weeks a group of U.S. students headed by Karen Winn of Walnut Creek, Calif., a University of California student here, had been

distributing posters and seeking antiwar petitions among both foreign and Spanish students.

The demonstrations opened with a meeting at the school of political and economic sciences, where students critical of U.S. policy ran into loud opposition from other students.

One irate student shouted: "You are supposed to be pacifists and you have Viet Cong flags. How can you have two banners?"

Such taunts were answered with "We are for Ho Chi Minh's peace, not for American wars."

Roberta Alexander, 20, of Los Angeles, a University of California exchange student, drew an ovation when she told the meeting: "I am a pacifist and I support the world movement against U.S. intervention in Vietnam."

Miss Winn also addressed the meeting. But neither she nor any other recognized American student took part in the burning of the U.S. flags—three paper flags and one of cloth. But she and others marched from the meeting with those carrying the flags to the area where the burnings occurred.

Police on riot duty at the edge of the university campus watched the flag incidents from a distance but did not interfere.

A Spanish official commented: "They—the organizers—have put us in an awkward position. If we send the police in to break up this campus demonstration the American students as well as the Spanish will shout police brutality. If we don't, others will blame the Spanish government for permitting this to happen."

CITIZENSHIP FOR YOUNG ALIENS WITH AMERICAN PARENTS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today is designed to insure full rights of American citizenship to children born in foreign lands and brought to this country by adoptive parents. This legislation would bring the protection of American law to the many children legally adopted and presently living in the United States, but who remain virtually without the rights and protection that native-born American children enjoy. There is insufficient protection against child abuse and abandonment. As stated in my bill:

An adopted child, whose adoptive parent or parents are citizens of the United States, becomes a citizen of the United States upon fulfillment of the following conditions:

- (1) The child was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.
- (2) The child was adopted before attaining the age of 16 years.
- (3) The child has resided continuously in the United States in legal custody of the adoptive parent or parents for one year after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

Since the foreign children most in need of adoption in this country have suffered serious hardships and deprivation, the psychological advantage to them of being accepted here as citizens without undergoing naturalization could significantly enhance their successful

adjustment to a new way of life as well as to a new family. In specific instances which have been brought to my attention by constituents, the questionable treatment of some of these children and the anguish caused to all concerned might have been prevented had the children enjoyed the right of American citizenship.

While under present law these children are eligible to be naturalized as citizens after 2 years' continuous residence in the United States, if they are under 18 years of age they must first obtain the written consent of their adoptive parents. I firmly believe this law should be made consistent with the current emphasis on total acceptance of the adopted child in the family by total acceptance of him as a citizen in our country. Our responsibility toward each adopted child is to further his best interests by guaranteeing that he, as a citizen, will benefit from, and be subject to, whatever State and Federal laws may be passed in the future to protect American citizens.

As a country, we have welcomed these children for many years, but I urge that now we make this welcome complete by enacting the proposed legislation providing them with the right to full citizenship with the privileges and responsibilities this includes.

FOR THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE RETURN OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT TO GREECE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I was deeply distressed by the military coup which resulted in the overthrow of the Government of Greece only a few days ago.

As an American of Greek origin, I have been particularly saddened to see the legitimate government of the birthplace of democracy removed by a group of army officers.

Two decades ago the United States helped Greece throw off the threat of a totalitarian government. At that time the Greek people were struggling to rebuild their nation after being held captive and ravaged for 5 years by the Nazis, and our assistance made the difference between freedom and tyranny for the Greeks.

Today the democratic and constitutional processes we did so much to help the Greeks restore have been thrust aside by a group of army officers who decided they must act to prevent what they described as a threatened Communist takeover.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the recognition of the U.S. Government extends not to the army or any other group but to King Constantine, and I trust that, in the present circumstances, we shall continue that recognition.

I want to express, however, some grave

reservations about the present political situation in Greece for the consideration of my colleagues in both the House and Senate and for the executive branch of our Government.

First, I hope that at the earliest possible moment there will be a return to the processes of constitutional, parliamentary democracy in Greece.

In this respect I was very glad to see King Constantine's statement of April 26, 1967, in which he declared:

... my ardent wish is also for the earliest possible return of the country to parliamentary government.

I also, Mr. Speaker, was most pleased to see that our own Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has made clear that the U.S. Government officially supports the earliest possible return of democratic institutions in Greece. I include at this point in the Record Secretary Rusk's statement of April 23, 1967:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK

We have followed closely the situation in Greece since the military take-over there last Friday.

I am encouraged to see that King Constantine in his first public statement since last Friday has called for an early return to parliamentary government. We are now awaiting concrete evidence that the new Greek government will make every effort to reestablish democratic institutions which have been an integral part of Greek political life. I am gratified that Greece will continue its strong support of NATO.

I also note that Minister Papadopoulos at a press conference yesterday is quoted as saying that the detained persons connected with the political leadership of Greece will be set free in a few days. I trust that this step will indeed be taken.

Ambassador Talbot has made unmistakably clear to the new government our concern for the safety of all political prisoners. He has received repeated assurances that they are well.

I also hope that the Greek people will be able at the earliest possible moment to enjoy the personal freedoms of speech, the press, and assembly.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the military officers now running the Greek Government will be especially watchful of the dignity and safety of all political prisoners, including former Premier George Papandreou, and his son, Andreas Papandreou, who has many friends in the United States and who is married to an American citizen.

Third, I hope that we will not see carried out what I understand is a plan to operate military courts to try civilians.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the U.S. Government, which presently has a military assistance agreement with Greece, should suspend any further major shipments under this agreement pending a review.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate the hope that the day will not be long when free and democratic elections will again be conducted in Greece, and a legitimate, popularly elected government returned to office. The early restoration of democratic institutions to the cradle of democracy is the most effective way to insure that the people of Greece will not have to endure a dictatorship of either the left or the right.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAs] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a commemorative day in the history of the Polish people. The adoption of Poland's Constitution on May 3, 1791, marks a historic moment in the development of constitutional democracy, and greatly affects the history of Poland. Embodied in this model of progressive legislation were the principles of representative self-government and justice for all. At a time when most of Europe, including Poland's powerful neighbors, was still in the grip of autocratic rulers, the Polish Constitution represented an advanced and enlightened system of government.

Poland was transformed into a hereditary constitutional monarchy, townspeople were given judicial autonomy and a degree of parliamentary representation, the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was established. The Poles rejoiced over these progressive measures—from the enlightened King Stanislas Augustus to the humblest citizen.

Less than a year after the Constitution was proclaimed, Poland was invaded by Russia. The Poles were defeated before they were able to strengthen themselves and were forced to see their country completely dismembered by Austria, Prussia, and Russia in 1793 and 1795.

Today, the Poles are still subjected to the controls of a Communist state. However, it is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Polish people that they have maintained their belief in, and commitment to, the principles which inspired their Constitution. They are still dedicated to reclaiming their heritage of freedom and national independence.

On this day, May 3, we Americans can honor Polish Constitution Day, which affords the opportunity for freedom-loving men everywhere to join with the Polish people and those of Polish descent throughout the world in reaffirming Poland's just aspirations as a nation.

All Americans share in the great hope for liberty which the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, symbolizes for the Polish people. Let us hope the day shall soon come when the people of Poland will have full intellectual and political freedom in their own independent state, established in the spirit of their great Constitution.

TEACHER CORPS ENDORSED

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAs] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star recently joined educators, newspapers, and others all across the Nation who have looked carefully at the operation of the Teacher Corps and found that—

The threat of a cutoff, or block to the modest expansion the administration proposes for next year, has no justification whatever.

The Star points out that the 1,200 young dedicated corpsmen serving in 29 States and the District of Columbia "have thus far drawn widespread praise."

In this regard, the Star editorial comment is no more than an accurate reflection of the testimony of educators from all sections of the country as to their own support of the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial by the Washington Star at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

The National Teacher Corps is one experiment of the Great Society which might logically have expected to receive the support of everyone. Instead, its brief two-year relationship with Congress has been a constant uphill struggle for appropriations barely sufficient to sustain life. And now Republican leaders reportedly want to kill the corps altogether by permitting its present authorization to run out in June.

This attitude is simply incomprehensible. The corps' function is to bring young college graduates into slum schools to work, under the guidance of experienced teachers, directly with deprived children. The corps members are channeled through 50 participating universities, where at the same time they continue studies leading to master's degrees. They are assigned only at the invitation of local school systems.

The 1,200 dedicated young people who are serving in school districts in 29 states and the city of Washington this year have thus far drawn widespread praise. After an analysis this month, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children issued a report asserting that the program's abolition or curtailment would be "a serious and wasteful error." That is surely the case. The benefits which accrue from this service to individual disadvantaged children in overcrowded classrooms is of course the value which springs first to mind. It may be, however, as the council suggests, that there is an even greater value in "harnessing the idealism of an unusual group of young people who, but for the corps, would never have been drawn to the teaching profession."

More tangible results should of course be awaited before anyone proposes the sort of massive program expansion which seems to us to be a distinct possibility in the future. But even now that is the direction which long-range thinking should be taking. The threat of a cutoff, or a block to the modest expansion the administration proposes for next year, has no justification whatever.

NATIONAL PTA OPPOSES QUIE SCHOOL BILL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAs] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, the National Congress of Parents & Teachers recently expressed its opposition to H.R. 8983, the most recent of the Quie substitutes for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The PTA states that the proposal raises very serious questions, among which are:

First. Lack of a public hearing.

Second. Inadequate funding.

Third. Not enough funds to poorest States—the Southern and border States—or to the States with large inner-city populations, such as California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas.

Fourth. State departments of education not yet strong enough for effective administration.

Fifth. Potential resurgence of church-state problems.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this statement from those most directly concerned with education—teachers and the parents of the children they teach—to my colleagues, and insert the statement at this point in the RECORD:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, Chicago, Ill., April 27, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We in the National PTA have long looked forward to general federal aid to public education. Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned that a proposal for general aid to education may be substituted for the present federal aid program without an opportunity for public discussion and public testimony.

Enclosed herewith for your consideration are the observations on this proposal which are going to our own membership, and we would invite your interest in the points of our concern.

We appreciate very much your past support of our children's schools and look forward to your future constructive measures.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDWARD F. RYAN,
National Chairman for Legislation.

PTA STATEMENT

To: State Chairmen for Legislation, Members of the National Board of Managers, From: Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, National Chairman for Legislation.

Re: H.R. 8983, Elementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967.

H.R. 8983, introduced on April 20 by Representative Albert R. Quie (R-Minn.), proposes to substitute "block grants" to the states for the greater part of the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to take effect July 1, 1968. PTA policy has looked forward to general federal aid to public schools, but this proposal raises very serious questions.

1. The proposal has not been given a public hearing, nor will there be such an opportunity. It will be offered on the floor of the House as a substitution for the Committee Report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. This is now scheduled tentatively for Wednesday, May 10.

2. Under the Block Grants Amendment total authorization for the year 1968-69 would be cut back from \$3.3 billion to \$3 billion. As you know, appropriations might be different.

3. Reallocations of aid under the proposed formula would cut back states with the highest number of disadvantaged children—all the Southern and border states, except for Maryland, and industrial states with large inner-city populations, such as New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas. Twenty-five states are cut back in all.

Also, the overseas dependents schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools are excluded. The National Teacher Corps would be ended, also aid for migrant, handicapped, and delinquent children. The National PTA supports all of these programs.

4. Many state departments of education have not yet been strengthened to the point of being able to administer such large sums effectively. The proposed grants would be used however the states saw fit, except that 50 percent would be used for educationally deprived children (as against 75 percent under ESEA) and 7 percent for library resources, textbooks, and equipment. No local entitlements would be established.

5. If we move into a general aid program before the church-state issue has been resolved in the courts, it seems inevitable that the previous great bitterness in these matters will not only be revived, but—what is worse—be transferred to separate state battlegrounds. It has been our view that orderly decision in the courts offers the only way to resolve these very divisive questions, and that they should be resolved nationally, on a constitutional basis, before we move into the general aid program.

It would be most helpful if you could bring these considerations to the attention of your own Congressmen, asking that they postpone this step until a general aid program can be introduced on a nonprofit or bipartisan basis after appropriate study.

RAYMOND F. FARRELL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, this evening the Rhode Island State Society of Washington will honor U.S. Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Raymond F. Farrell with its Man of the Year Award. Ray Farrell has had more than 30 years of Federal Government service and his record of excellence as a career official would be quite difficult to match. He is a fair and understanding man, and an efficient and objective administrator. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Commissioner Farrell on behalf of all Rhode Island citizens for his splendid accomplishments in government. Rhode Island can well be proud of this native son. Mrs. Tiernan and I wish him many future years of rewarding governmental service.

At this point, if there is no objection, I wish to include a biography of Commissioner Farrell in the RECORD:

COMMISSIONER RAYMOND F. FARRELL

Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell, a native of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, is a graduate of Georgetown University and The Georgetown Law Center. He has served in various governmental agencies among them the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Interior, and as special counsel to the Joint Committee in Congress investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since 1941, Mr. Farrell has been with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. Farrell's career with the Immigration and Naturalization Service was interrupted in May, 1942, when he went on active duty in the United States Army. He received the Bronze Star Medal for outstanding duty in the Rome-Arno campaign and was separated

from the service in November, 1945, with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Shortly after his discharge from the service, Mr. Farrell returned to the Immigration Service and was named Chief of Investigations at New York City. In 1949, he was named Assistant Commissioner for Research and Education, and in 1952, he became Assistant Commissioner for Investigations. In 1958, Mr. Farrell was promoted to Associate Commissioner in charge of Service Operations.

The late President Kennedy nominated Raymond Farrell to the post of Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and he was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate on February 5, 1962.

Mr. Farrell's record as Commissioner since 1962 has been recognized as a new era of compassion and understanding in administering the nation's immigration and nationality laws. In 1964, President Johnson described Ray Farrell's administration as an example of "government with a heart."

Mr. Farrell has been honored by Georgetown University's Alumni Achievement Award in 1961 and by the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers with its Certificate of Appreciation.

Commissioner Farrell is married to the former Charlotte M. Griedel of Mather, Pennsylvania.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK AT PATRICK HENRY BOYS PLANTATION ON APRIL 29, 1967

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, our good colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, made a splendid address at the Patrick Henry Boys Plantation in Virginia on April 29.

I have read his remarks with keen interest and have delighted in the many historical references which he has included therein.

Representative Tuck has the distinction of having served as one of Virginia's finest governors and is a keen student of the history of the Commonwealth of Virginia as well as of the history of the United States.

Some of the references made in his address are of such genuine interest that I wish to include his remarks at this point in the RECORD. I commend his address to the reading of the Members of the House.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT PATRICK HENRY BOYS PLANTATION ON APRIL 29, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a genuine joy and pleasure for me to be here on this occasion and to have the opportunity of again visiting these historic grounds and to meet and mingle with so many wonderful people who have devoted themselves to such a worthy cause as brings us here today.

I commend the Alice Kyle District of the Federation of Women's Clubs for arranging, in cooperation with the Patrick Henry Boys Plantation, this assembly. It provides for all of us an opportunity to renew acquaintances and to reappraise the work that is being done. Too much cannot be said in praise of these ladies, as well as of the members of the

American Legion Auxiliary, the Colonial Dames, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other contributing organizations and persons for their work in the establishment of this home and training center for the benefit of our youth.

There come to mind today the names of so many prominent persons who have made contributions of incalculable value to the acquisition and establishment of this memorial. One of them, the late Honorable James S. Easley, has gone to his final reward. His contributions, as well as those of a number of others, need not be detailed because the knowledge of them is so widespread. His name and those of others have become indelibly inscribed and will long live in the hearts and minds of all who cherish the history of our nation and who have an understanding and appreciation of the value of youth.

I must also mention the name of Eugene Casey, the great friend and philanthropist who has made the work here possible and who, with his beautiful lady, has honored us with a visit today. I know that we also think of the contributions of great value made by the Honorable Robert S. Chamberlayne, Honorable D. Q. Eggleston, Dr. James D. Hagood, Mrs. Lucy Page Williams, and others.

I regret that circumstances have been such that I, myself, could not take a more active part, but I can assure you that from the very beginning I was glad to give at least a small part of my time to the establishment of a living memorial to the great Virginian who once looked out with pride on these acres, where stands his last home and wherein lie his mortal remains.

The purpose of the Patrick Henry Boys Plantation is to make a home for young men and to educate and train them to become useful citizens. One of the great early American moralists, Charles B. Fairbanks, who himself lived only thirty-two years, once said, "The genuine boy may, I think, be safely set down as the noblest work of God." Alongside this thought we can add the truism that to save a boy is to save a man.

The Boys Plantation program has been carefully projected. It is designed to provide a home for neglected and dependent boys who through no fault of their own are homeless, to inculcate in them a feeling of security, to make them aware of high morals and spiritual steadfastness, but, above all, to teach them law and order and to give them training which will make them useful citizens.

The importance of the individual in this country cannot be over emphasized, and it is hoped that each boy here may be encouraged to think of himself as an individual whose duty it is to participate in the events of his time.

Statues of cold marble are built for the purposes of honoring patriots and heroes. A lifeless museum has its place, but this Plantation is a living memorial. It is dedicated to the memory of one of our greatest Americans. Patrick Henry's influence upon this nation has been tremendous, and those of us who still espouse the fundamental principles which he so eloquently stated and advocated can well wish that the nation had strictly adhered to his advice and counsel. Let us hope that even now the inspiration and teachings of this patriot may serve to revive a renewed interest in the doctrines which guided him and the founding fathers in the establishment of this republic.

Patrick Henry was an individualist. He was also a man of extraordinary ability and courage. He originated in a backwoods section, and when he first appeared at Virginia's capital, then at Williamsburg, his rough clothes drew much attention, but it was not long before he was being looked at and listened to for another reason: his voice was rising in oratory and crying out for freedom and liberty in terms that had not before or since been heard in this country.

It was Henry's voice that sparked the Revolution. The ideals of democracy found vocal expression in his flaming oratory. But in the formation of the government chosen for the new republic, things did not go to suit him, and he raised his voice in stubborn protest.

After breaking away from England, the colonists settled on a government under the Articles of Confederation of 1781. This failed to command appropriate respect, and the government did not function effectively. As its collapse was imminent, a general Constitutional Convention was called in May, 1787, and out of this came the United States Constitution, which, in order to become effective, had to be ratified by the original thirteen states.

Patrick Henry was among those who opposed ratification because of fear that too much power would be vested in the central government. He fought for states' rights, and it was largely through his efforts that we have the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as our Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights places restrictions on the Federal Government, and undertakes to reserve rights and powers to the states and to the people thereof.

The conditions of the present day clearly establish that the fears and the predictions of Patrick Henry were justified, for much of what he predicted has come true. More and more the government is being centered in Washington and the power of the individual states is lessened. Henry stood firmly in opposition to this usurpation of the states' powers and tried repeatedly to give warning of the consequences. The time has come now when we should return to his way of thinking in order to keep us from moving over the brink into senseless socialism.

There are so many events in the life of Patrick Henry that may be adverted to on such an occasion as this, but I like to think of the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1788 in which Henry took so prominent a part and in which he so vigorously and ably presented his sentiments and fears—to a large extent the same sentiments and fears which envelop many among the thoughtful populace of America of this generation.

The profound historian, Dr. Meade, has benefited us with his talent by publishing the best works available on the life of Patrick Henry. I commend his volumes to every American.

Some years ago I read the life of John Marshall by the great historian, the late Senator Beveridge of Indiana. Likewise, I commend these books to students of American history. I refer today to Beveridge largely because he lived in a distant state and devoted his works to John Marshall, who was opposed to Henry, and even this opposite view portrays Henry as the outstanding delegate at the Virginia Constitutional Convention.

In his matchless volume on the subject of Marshall, Beveridge devotes 161 pages to the Convention which convened in Richmond on June 2, 1788, and undertakes to describe some of the participants. He leads off with Patrick Henry, prematurely old at fifty-two; Pendleton, walking heavily under the burden of his years and a cripple; then Randolph, Monroe, Marshall, and Richard Henry Lee, who were young men barely past the age of thirty.

Mr. Beveridge described in some detail these men and James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, signer of the Declaration of Independence and destined to be the father of a President and the great-grandfather of another. The presiding officer of the convention was Virginia's first law teacher and able chancellor, the aged and white-haired George Wythe. There came also from Gunston Hall the aristocratic and brilliant, but gouty, George Mason.

Throughout the entire proceedings the

great influence of Washington for the adoption of the Constitution hovered over the convention. Mason and others of almost equal brilliance had come to unite with Patrick Henry to oppose the adoption of the Constitution unless it was amended to embody the principal provisions of the Virginia Bill of Rights. For the first time in American history a shorthand reporter was present to report the debate and the proceedings which continued for twenty-two days.

It was a great display of talent and patriotism. Senator Beveridge says that the array of ability, distinction, and character on both sides was notably brilliant and impressive. He added that seldom, if ever, in any land or age had so gifted and accomplished a group of men contended in argument and discussion at one time and place.

Beveridge also stated that the debates of the Constitutional Convention of Virginia constituted the only full and genuine discussions of the Constitution of the United States which took place anywhere, even including the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787.

For what were Henry, Mason, Monroe, Grayson, and others contending? They were seeking to guarantee the very principles for which we contend today, the preservation of the individual and state's rights, and to take care that certain imperishable truths should be embodied in the fundamental law of the land.

As set forth in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, they believed that all power is vested in and consequently derived from the people, that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them. They believed, among other things, that each state had a right to maintain a well-regulated militia, that no soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, that the people have a right to be secure in their persons and to be protected from unwarranted searches and seizures. They contended that the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty and can never be restrained but by despotic governments; and any citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible only for the abuse of that right.

And importantly, too, they believed and contended that in criminal prosecutions a man has the right to demand the cause and nature of his accusation, to be confronted with the accusers and witnesses, to call for evidence in his favor, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of his vicinage without whose unanimous consent he cannot be found guilty, that none shall be deprived of life or liberty, except by the law of the land or the judgment of his peers; nor be compelled in any criminal proceeding to give evidence against himself, nor be put twice in jeopardy for the same offense.

They were joined by the great Roger Williams of Rhode Island and his band of hearty followers who established that state, small in area and population, but at that time great in its determination and rocky strength of character.

Rhode Island was the last of the colonies to adopt the Constitution and so zealous were the followers of Roger Williams to maintain and preserve the autonomy of the states and to guarantee complete and absolute separation of church and state that the adopting resolutions of Rhode Island contained on this subject substantially the language of Jefferson's Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, also incorporated in the Bill of Rights, and I quote directly therefrom: "That religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator as well as the manner of discharging it can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and

that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity toward each other."

No religion is worthy or has a right to exist which has to depend for its support upon government or law.

There is another provision in the Virginia Bill of Rights which every thoughtful American, and particularly those in public life, should take to heart today, to the effect "that no free government, or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

As a result of the debates led by Patrick Henry in the Virginia Convention of 1788, the people of other states were aroused to such an extent that they were determined to see that the Bill of Rights, as contended for by Henry and Mason, should be incorporated in the Constitution of the United States; and Congress at the very next session submitted the first ten amendments which constitute the Bill of Rights, and these amendments were promptly ratified by the requisite number of states.

It is of interest to observe also that the principal provisions of the Virginia Bill of Rights have been incorporated into the Constitution of nearly all of the states of the American Union.

I hope that we of the present generation do not take as commonplace our rich heritage and the priceless privileges which we have enjoyed for so long. We must never be unmindful of the sacrifice made by our founding fathers and their struggles to secure these blessings. It behooves us ever to be vigilant in our determination to preserve these blessings. It has been truly said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Disregarding the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the principles for which Henry contended, the Federal Government is about to absorb all of the powers of the states. The right of the states to control their own affairs lies at the very heart of what has made this nation great.

The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered in the last few years, together with the acts of the Congress and the complete disregard of our constitutional rights by the Executive Department of the Federal Government, have been such as to alarm all thoughtful and patriotic citizens and students of history. These governmental actions have served to abridge the powers of the states and to invade the rights of the individual.

In addition to the horrendous domestic situation in which we find ourselves, we face a most dangerous problem in world affairs, particularly in Vietnam. I listened yesterday to the gallant General Westmoreland, the Commanding General of our American forces in that beleaguered area, when he spoke to us in the hall of the House of Representatives at Washington.

There are elements in this country creating a problem almost if not indeed equally as serious as the troubles caused by our enemies in the Vietcong. A number of the so-called leaders in both our national political parties, in order to gain the support of certain minority groups, have catered to these evil forces. As a result, there has arisen to power and influence a lot of despicable characters. You know their names. I will not soil my lips or offend your ears by calling them. They would destroy us from within and from without.

I have advocated legislation to make it unlawful for these incendiaries to go from one state to another to spread their poison for the purpose of inciting to riot or to engage in the violation of any law. There is ample legislative precedent for such an enactment, such for instance as the trans-

portation of stolen property across state lines and crossing of state lines to promote vice or to avoid prosecution.

As we all know, our Bill of Rights guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom to criticize and petition our government. I oppose the abridgement of these rights. I contend that they should be strictly upheld. They may be and should be, under appropriate conditions, freely exercised.

But the Constitution does not confer upon any person or group of persons the right to band or weld themselves together in such a fashion as to impede the police in the exercise of their powers to enforce the law and suppress public mischief. Nor does the Constitution give to these elements the right to hamper American citizens in the lawful pursuit of their business and avocations.

In other words, there is no right in our Constitution that permits these lawless groups to lie down in the streets or otherwise group themselves in such a fashion as to block traffic and commerce. In my judgment, it is the duty of the police to use such force as is necessary to arrest and remove such people. Some call this police brutality. I do not.

As I understand the Constitution of the United States, it was never intended to permit thousands of people, led as some of them now are, to gather as they did recently in New York in celebration of what these pro-Communists called "Vietnam Week."

They denounced our foreign policy in such a manner as to give strength and comfort to the enemy, which will result in the prolongation of the Vietnam war and will result also in the loss of many of our young men who constitute the flower of the manhood of America.

Methods must be devised and scales adjusted by which to deal firmly and resolutely with these beatniks, peaceniks, and flag-burners who would destroy our Constitution, shatter our Bill of Rights, and deliver us into the hands of world Communism, the most horrible enemy of mankind that ever existed.

We can now take courage from the knowledge that this motley crew constitutes only a small percentage of the people. They represent the same tiny element which advocates the abolishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. They are to a large extent the same people who would destroy sacred American institutions and would change our way of life so that we would no longer know our government as it was formulated by the founding fathers of America, such as Patrick Henry.

In these times we can be heartened by the knowledge that the overwhelming majority of our citizenship remains patriotic and ready and willing to make such sacrifices as may be required to support to the fullest extent our boys as long as they remain in Vietnam or any other foreign land, wearing the uniform of our country and following the flag of America.

In the long saga of history, America has been blessed with a citizenship determined in time of peace or peril to uphold the priceless principles and privileges which we enjoy. Our national banner has never trailed in the inglorious and ignominious dust of defeat. It never will.

POCHO'S PROGRESS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American community of Los Angeles was shocked by the recent insulting and distorted article, "Pocho's Progress," which appeared in the April 28 issue of Time magazine.

I was surprised and disappointed to learn that a major national publication would print an account of the life of a people, rich in heritage and culture, by generalizing from an unintelligent observation of a few examples.

The article is replete with the kind of coded, but easily identified, ethnic slurs well calculated to stir latent prejudice in an unsuspecting reader—a regrettable example of a vicious type of freewheeling journalistic license unworthy of the high standard of factual reporting we have a right to expect from any reputable magazine.

It is an insult to more than 4 million U.S.-born Americans of Mexican descent, called "Pochos" by Time magazine—a term long considered most derogatory and degrading. It is degrading, also, to our younger generation who are struggling to improve their condition by more active participation in their community affairs.

Those who take their position in the lifestream of our Nation, raise a family, buy a home, and strive for an education in the schools, colleges, and universities of California deeply resent being branded "Agringados" by Time magazine because they were neatly dressed and had "adapted to Anglo style."

And most of all, Mr. Speaker, it is an insult to Mexico and to the "newly arrived" from our great Republic to the south whom Time magazine calls "Cholos" the most insulting term of all. It is no wonder that Time magazine caused raised eyebrows in Latin America where the article was first brought to my attention.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what Time magazine would call Pvt. Daniel Fernandez, recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously by President Johnson. Would Time call him and his fellow American soldiers of Mexican descent—those 17 Medal of Honor winners and the many who died for their country in Europe, the Pacific, Korea, and Vietnam—"Pochos," "Pachucos," "Cholos," or would they just be "Agringados" because, like all other Americans, they were fighting in the uniform of their country?

The bigotry and bias of the writer is clearly evidenced in the article "Pocho's Progress," and is an affront and insult to persons of Mexican descent in both Mexico and the United States.

I realize it was probably written by a prejudiced individual with a preconceived misconception of Mexican culture.

The writer also could have written his article in the "cantinas" which he describes so well.

But the truth of the matter is that the second largest minority in the United States has been deeply hurt by Time magazine's attempt to perpetuate pro-

found misunderstanding about the Mexican-American community, its culture, its aspirations, and its contribution to the United States.

As a Member of Congress, and on behalf of some 5 million Americans of Mexican descent, I urgently request Time magazine to issue an immediate apology for this gratuitous affront and calculated ethnic slur against the Spanish-speaking community of our Southwestern States.

I believe such action is required not only in the interest of domestic harmony among our own people, but particularly because of the unfortunate effect this article may well have on our longstanding "good neighbor" relationship with the citizens of Mexico, our fellow American Republic with whom we share a common border nearly 2,000 miles long.

TWO CLEVELAND CLERGYMEN HONORED BY CIVIC AND NATIONALITY LEADERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently in Cleveland a testimonial dinner was held to honor Msgr. Joseph C. Feghali, of St. Maron Catholic Church, and Rev. Daniel Rodriguez, of Wesley Methodist Church.

These clergymen were honored for their continued application of religious precepts to community problems. In honoring them, observers at the dinner said they found the inspiration to emulate them.

The Spanish American peoples with whom Reverend Rodriguez lives and works, and to whom Monsignor Feghali has pledged support, are making a valiant effort to help raise themselves to economic security. They need the help of the some 60 persons who attended the dinner and others, if they are to succeed. Participants at the dinner were representatives of many ethnic groups, plus the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religions. Through the efforts of such men and agencies as Reverend Rodriguez, Monsignor Feghali, Father Gabriel Hannan, of the Spanish Catholic Mission, Jose Rodriguez, of the Spanish American Betterment Committee, of Mosises Maldonado, and others, the Cleveland Spanish-Americans are making progress. But they need the continued cooperation of influential church and civic leaders. No people can find a responsible place in a society without the cooperation of that society. Monsignor Feghali has made notable contributions to his ethnic community and to the greater Cleveland area.

Through the testimonial dinner mentioned, and other programs, responsible Clevelanders are informing the Nation that the nationality groups of Cleveland will not allow one group of people to remain in isolation. Together, church and other civic leaders are now working jointly to make life in our country better for all Americans and those people in our Nation who desire to be citizens.

To be commended are Daniel L. Mausser and his wife, Dr. Ellen Vaughn Maus-

ser, who were the hosts of the dinner meeting. Mr. and Dr. Mausser have worked for and with minority groups and ethnic groups for many years in Cleveland and elsewhere. Their tireless efforts to help bring mankind together in harmony to solve problems should be an example for all of us who consider ourselves good Americans.

H.R. 478 AND H.R. 479—FOREIGN IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a rising tide of imports in all branches of the U.S. economy.

Recently the mushroom growers and canners of my State, and the Tanners Council of America, Inc., sent me the following information:

Re H.R. 478 and H.R. 479.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,

Chairman, General Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As members of the Steering Committee of the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation we wish to advise you of our deep concern over the adverse effect increased imports from Taiwan have had on the domestic industry and its workers.

It is our understanding that on May 10, 1967 representatives of the American Mushroom Canners Committee of the Pennsylvania Canners and Food Processors Association, who represent over ninety percent of the domestic producers will appear before your Committee in hearings concerned with the above bills.

Since they are its most important single agricultural cash crop, mushrooms are of very great importance to the State of Pennsylvania. Three-fourths of the nation's growers and more than half the canners are located in Pennsylvania, employing over 10,-

000 people and producing a gross income of approximately \$50 million a year.

In this connection, speaking for the members of the Pennsylvania delegation we urge consideration of the fact that within the short space of six years, imports of canned mushrooms from Taiwan have increased dramatically and now amounts to 25 percent of domestic consumption and one third of domestic sales. In 1960/61, Taiwan exported only 317,000 pounds of mushrooms to the United States, whereas in 1966/67, that country will send in the unbelievable quantity of 14½ million pounds. There is no limit in sight as Taiwan is rapidly increasing its production each year.

The sharp increase in imports of canned mushrooms from Taiwan is due directly to differences in growing and processing costs in the United States and Taiwan. And differences in costs between the two countries can be traced primarily to differences in wage rates rather than to major differences in growing methods or processing practices. In both countries, growing and processing of mushrooms are labor intensive operations. For example, harvesting of mushrooms is a hand operation in both countries. Similarly, canning operations in both countries require handling of individual mushrooms during initial stages of processing. Similarities in technologies of growing and processing accompanied by wide differences in wage rates between the two countries result in higher costs per unit of product in the U.S. than in Taiwan.

We are advised by representatives of the Mushroom Canners Committee that not only are wage rates in Taiwan from 3.5 to 5 cents an hour but that a significant number of the workers are under U.S. age requirements and work more hours than allowed under U.S. Wage and Hour Laws. Most of this child labor is made up of young girls who are used in the peeling, washing, sorting, slicing, trimming and labeling operations—all of which are done by hand.

We believe that these labor conditions are detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers. The unregulated importation of canned mushrooms produced under these conditions in Taiwan constitutes an unfair method of

competition in commerce. We commend the efforts of your Committee to investigate this important matter.

TANNER'S COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

IMPORTS OF LEATHER, SHOES AND OTHER LEATHER PRODUCTS

Imports of leather, shoes and leather products have reached record proportions. This trade is one sided and non-reciprocal. The direct result is an unprecedented invasion of the U.S. market, an invasion which clearly threatens the future of American industry. The scope of the invasion and its danger are apparent from the following summary figures.

Imports of shoes. The shoe imports recorded below include only leather types. In addition, millions of pairs of vinyl, canvas and non-leather types were brought in during 1966, enough to make the gross import total equal 16 percent of aggregate U.S. footwear production.

Leather footwear

[In thousands of pairs]

	Imports	Exports
1952.....	1,216	4,825
1953.....	1,235	5,159
1954.....	1,049	4,750
1955.....	1,785	4,642
1956.....	2,996	4,532
1957.....	4,956	4,398
1958.....	16,099	4,225
1959.....	11,057	3,505
1960.....	12,980	3,244
1961.....	15,078	3,035
1962.....	21,106	2,867
1963.....	26,162	2,843
1964.....	27,557	2,836
1965.....	34,723	2,491
1966.....	46,036	2,737

¹ In 1966, there were also imported more than 46,000,000 pairs of vinyl shoes and 35,000,000 pairs of rubber-canvas types, making a grand total of 132,187,600 pairs.

Foreign trade in leather. The traditional relation of leather exports and imports has been completely reversed. Last year imports far outweighed exports from the U.S. and accounted for a substantial proportion of domestic consumption. The pertinent facts by types of leather were:

Imports of leather

[Thousands of square feet]

	Finished cattle hide leathers ¹	Other cattle hide ²	Calfskins		Goatskins	Sheep and lambskins		Finished cattle hide leathers ¹	Other cattle hide ²	Calfskins		Goatskins	Sheep and lambskins
			Linings	Other						Linings	Other		
1952.....	3,193	(³)	2,655	4,962	4,537	1,715	1960.....	10,542	(³)	10,597	15,705	12,114	11,363
1953.....	5,022	(³)	4,595	3,909	5,424	5,237	1961.....	11,649	(³)	10,055	17,357	13,761	11,241
1954.....	4,011	(³)	4,390	4,085	4,548	4,936	1962.....	12,016	(³)	11,264	19,830	12,404	9,747
1955.....	6,204	(³)	4,398	6,667	7,133	7,748	1963.....	14,649	(³)	10,461	17,404	12,080	7,991
1956.....	8,365	(³)	5,181	8,546	7,739	9,652	1964.....	14,428	18,024	10,531	19,651	11,348	4,977
1957.....	9,653	(³)	8,262	11,996	9,666	9,667	1965.....	21,894	36,474	9,645	18,867	16,096	6,516
1958.....	9,472	(³)	7,184	15,639	9,574	9,518	1966.....	20,801	49,827	10,156	21,255	16,503	8,460
1959.....	16,624	(³)	11,876	18,610	14,789	16,198							

¹ Except sole, belting, and harness.

² Bovine leather, not specially provided for, including all crust and rough tanned.

³ Not available.

Exports of leather

[Thousands of square feet]

	Cattle hide upper and patent	Calfskins	Goatskins	Sheep and lamb skins		Cattle hide upper and patent	Calfskins	Goatskins	Sheep and lamb skins
1952.....	18,467	2,296	6,148	7,219	1960.....	18,746	2,886	5,150	38,941
1953.....	26,741	2,717	6,025	8,249	1961.....	22,674	3,406	6,309	68,040
1954.....	30,491	2,219	5,278	7,003	1962.....	12,967	2,227	3,385	48,254
1955.....	29,155	2,424	4,348	9,704	1963.....	14,499	2,328	7,442	55,227
1956.....	26,024	2,797	4,124	9,264	1964.....	14,027	2,215	6,219	43,276
1957.....	24,585	2,155	4,013	11,989	1965.....	16,113	2,265	8,456	42,924
1958.....	26,373	1,738	3,713	15,208	1966.....	16,827	1,682	4,974	42,015
1959.....	18,272	1,799	4,942	21,827					

Leather products. Included in the import tide are huge quantities of handbags, gloves, personal leather goods, baseball gloves and leather novelties. For example, leather handbag imports in 1966 reached almost 2 million pieces, more than 35% of domestic usage.

Glove imports of more than 1,500,000 pairs exceeded production in the U.S. Both of the foregoing products demonstrate what could happen in shoes and even in leather if present policies of the U.S. government are not changed. By the end of 1966, it may be noted,

imports of shoes, leather and leather products represented the equivalent of at least two months operations by the U.S. tanning industries.

The cattle hide position

[Thousands of hides]

	Total domestic supply	Net exports	Available for domestic consumption	Domestic wettings		Total domestic supply	Net exports	Available for domestic consumption	Domestic wettings
1960.....	27,590	6,568	21,022	20,896	1964.....	33,262	11,226	22,036	21,918
1961.....	28,012	7,351	20,661	21,424	1965.....	34,550	13,019	21,531	22,492
1962.....	28,516	6,708	21,808	21,511	1966.....	35,520	14,031	21,489	23,091
1963.....	29,800	7,612	22,188	20,843	1967 (estimated).....	34,100			23,091

¹ Requirements.

TANNERS' STOCKS

[Thousands of hides]

	Raw	Process	Finished	Total		Raw	Process	Finished	Total
Dec. 31, 1960.....	1,706	4,249	2,038	7,993	Dec. 31, 1964.....	1,811	3,801	1,962	7,574
Dec. 31, 1961.....	1,535	3,899	1,845	7,279	Dec. 31, 1965.....	1,847	3,547	1,723	7,117
Dec. 31, 1962.....	1,659	3,800	2,024	7,483	Nov. 30, 1966.....	1,878	3,422	1,829	7,129
Dec. 31, 1963.....	1,712	3,933	2,066	7,711					

The calf and kip position

[Thousands of skins]

	Total domestic supply	Net exports	Available for domestic consumption	Domestic wettings		Total domestic supply	Net exports	Available for domestic consumption	Domestic wettings
1960.....	8,611	766	7,845	7,620	1964.....	7,625	388	7,237	7,401
1961.....	8,061	1,127	6,934	7,324	1965.....	7,778	1,419	6,359	6,774
1962.....	7,854	613	7,241	6,754	1966.....	6,870	1,014	4,956	4,750
1963.....	7,198	-48	7,246	6,791	1967 (estimated).....	6,500			6,500

¹ Requirements.

TANNERS' STOCKS

[Thousands of skins]

	Raw	Process	Finished	Total		Raw	Process	Finished	Total
Dec. 31, 1960.....	750	1,560	837	3,147	Dec. 31, 1964.....	908	1,722	950	3,580
Dec. 31, 1961.....	932	1,475	776	3,183	Dec. 31, 1965.....	592	1,570	717	2,879
Dec. 31, 1962.....	885	1,345	847	3,077	Nov. 30, 1966.....	530	1,062	460	2,042
Dec. 31, 1963.....	864	1,621	900	3,385					

U.S. export destinations

CATTLE HIDES

[Thousands of hides]

	Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Other	Total		Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Other	Total
1960.....	2,392	468	2,498	1,158	372	6,888	1964.....	3,811	680	4,250	1,895	868	11,504
1961.....	3,174	628	2,088	1,246	470	7,645	1965.....	3,777	1,821	5,070	1,968	673	13,309
1962.....	3,008	847	1,816	1,170	277	7,118	1966.....	3,904	2,621	4,140	2,594	867	14,216
1963.....	3,405	914	1,962	1,138	551	7,970							

CALFSKINS AND KIPS

[Thousands of skins]

	Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Other	Total		Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Other	Total
1960.....	445	58	965	649	11	2,128	1964.....	857	7	1,125	339	63	2,391
1961.....	600	69	1,225	630	23	2,547	1965.....	438	98	1,414	469	40	2,459
1962.....	709	58	926	356	6	2,055	1966.....	594	221	1,190	550	27	2,582
1963.....	735	41	787	232	64	1,859							

Mr. Speaker, in line with other industries, the food-producing industry is being swamped with import damage.

We have closed our eyes to the serious threat to the present and the grave danger of complete collapse of our economy in a few short years.

It started with glass, coal, ceramics, and later shoes, bags, textiles, steel, and hundreds of other products.

Now it has reached the U.S. food locker. The end is in sight, our time is running out.

The only consolation if one can enjoy such a consolation is that all other countries will collapse with us.

Mr. Speaker, hearings of my committee definitely show effects of imports on jobs reaching a stage of real concern for the U.S. economic future.

It seems that no industry is import-damage proof. Apparently, there are only two outs for industry, automate and eliminate labor, join the importers by importing their products from abroad and selling to their own established markets, or just go out of business.

I quote from testimony given by Eugene Stone, head of the largest U.S. producer of apparel:

Jobs for an estimated 100,000 workers in the U.S. apparel industry do not exist today due to the importation of apparel goods into this country, according to Eugene E. Stone, III, president of the Stone Manufacturing Company, of Greenville, South Carolina, speaking in behalf of the American Apparel Manufacturing Association, the major trade association for the U.S. apparel industry.

Stone pointed out in his testimony before the subcommittee that—

The developing countries of the East, the rebuilt countries of Western Europe and countries of South America have established new, modern and efficient apparel plants which provide many more clothes than these countries need themselves. This excess comes into our country to compete with the output of our own apparel industry which has not generated sufficient earnings to build all new plants and install today's most efficient machinery.

Tracing the history of the U.S. efforts to help these underdeveloped countries, Stone cited figures showing that from 1958 until 1961, cotton apparel imports increased 34 percent. From 1962 until 1966, under the long-term cotton textile arrangement—LTA—cotton apparel imports increased 37 percent. Wool and manmade fiber apparel imports are not regulated under the arrangement with the greatest growth in apparel imports recently coming in the manmade fiber products. Manmade fiber apparel imports were 49 million equivalent square yards—SYE—in 1962, and jumped to 230 million SYE by the end of 1966, an increase of 370 percent.

Total apparel imports have increased 63 percent since 1962, with the total dollar value of these imports amounting to \$518 million. And this does not include leather, rubberized goods, silk, linen or other apparel, Stone pointed out.

He explained to the subcommittee that labor is the second most important cost of production in the U.S. apparel industry, accounting for about 31 percent of sales revenue in 1965, while the cost of raw materials, mostly fabric, was 43 percent. He said:

Labor, not capital, is the expensive productive element in making apparel.

Citing examples, he explained that the average hourly wage paid to apparel production workers in the United States in 1965 was \$1.83, rising to \$1.90 in 1966. In addition, the average employer paid 25 to 30 cents per hour for non-income-type benefit payments for each employee. Total compensation to all apparel employees in 1966 is estimated at close to \$6 billion, Stone reminded me.

He compared the U.S. wage standard with the labor picture in Hong Kong, where the average woman apparel production worker was paid the equivalent of 17 cents an hour in 1965.

Refuting the traditional argument that lower wages do not necessarily mean lower labor costs, Stone pointed out that the average Hong Kong apparel worker received only one-tenth as much as the average American apparel production worker, and then asked:

Are we 10 times more efficient? Absolutely not!

He pointed out that in many instances, with modern plants, modern machines, and modern methods, foreign production

is as good as in any American apparel plant.

He then went on to picture the number of U.S. apparel workers it is estimated are displaced by imports. Assuming that the average apparel employee works 2,000 hours per year, it is possible to estimate that some 62,600 workers are displaced by cotton apparel imports; 15,100 displaced from wool apparel imports; and 22,300 from the imports of manmade fiber apparel items.

Stone also pointed out that the nature of the apparel industry is such that it could, if given a fair chance to grow, hire many semiskilled workers—people who could join the 1.2 million production workers already in the industry. He said:

Currently, 89% of our labor force are production workers.

An international agreement covering textile and apparel products of all fiber including manmade, was called for by Stone. He said:

An agreement of this type must allow the American apparel industry to have a share in the growth of domestic demand.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the issue is so serious that I include certain testimony before my committee:

STATEMENT BY DON MAHON, BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HON. JOHN H. DENT, CHAIRMAN, MAY 1967

My name is Don Mahon, I am President of the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse and Dairy Workers and Executive Secretary of the National Federation of Independent Unions.

I appreciate your invitation and the opportunity to appear before this Committee. At this hearing, I am accompanied by Mr. Ralph Frey, President of the American Watch Workers Union. Mr. Frey will be pleased to answer your questions and will elaborate further on problems facing many union members and their related industry.

The workers we represent are all greatly concerned with the problems and competition resulting from foreign imports. The impact of these foreign imports on American industry and employees is becoming an increasingly serious threat. We wish to stress that we do not believe in isolationism. At the same time, we do not believe that preservation of the American standard of living necessitates that our labor, industry and agriculture have adequate insurance against unfair foreign competition.

For this reason, I wish to endorse H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 in behalf of the organizations I represent. We feel that adoption, and proper administration of these amendments when adopted, would provide a more effective means whereby the blindspot now existing with regard to determination of the holding of hearings on the Fair-Labor Standards Act could be eliminated. Under the existing law, the right to be heard or to get a hearing when needed is severely restricted since it is left almost entirely at the discretion of the Secretary and thereby the whims of current administration policy.

My first reference will be to the food industry. In essence, the adverse effects of the import of large quantities of meat and dairy products is a heavily contributing factor to the low farm prices that plague the American farmer. This results in less production and under employment for meatpacking, dairy and related food industry workers. The standard of living of both is thereby threatened.

Such imports also constitute an additional drain on United States dollars and promotes more inflationary pressures.

This causes the economy of our country to be weakened at a time when we should be combating inflation and utilizing our own manpower and superior production facilities in every manner possible.

In the meatpacking, dairy and related food industry, due to automation, there is a constant reduction in the number of workers gainfully employed when considered from the standpoint of volume produced and the ever increasing population with its ever increasing food requirements. In connection with the future impact of foreign imports, we must project the results on this basis. If permitted to continually increase, it will be disastrous both to the industry and the workers involved.

Much of the processing in the meatpacking and dairy industry is eliminated when these imports are brought in already processed or even partially processed. Our concern is not limited to the processing workers because we realize that the initial source of the raw material is equally important. Thereby, all American workers have a close community of interest with the American farmer. Mistakes in judgment and unrealistic management by the present administration has resulted in a serious situation affecting agriculture and the dairy industry in this country. When the American farmer cannot afford to produce the raw material due to cheap foreign competition our members jobs are eliminated, too. At the present time, the farmer is in a deadly price-cost squeeze. Unquestionably, part of this problem results from unfair foreign competition.

From one year ago, according to Agriculture Department figures, hog prices are down from 25 to 30%, beef cattle down 10.4%, lambs down 19.8%, eggs are down 16.9%, and chickens are down 17.9%. The parity ratio currently stands at 74 and is expected to drop even lower as production costs continue to rise. Farm debt is on the increase rising some 4.2 billion dollars in 1966. Total beef and veal imports were up 27% in 1966 over the previous year; meat under the Meat Import Quota Amendment (Public Law 88-482) was up 34%; pork imports were up 14%; lamb imports up 19%, mutton imports up 102% and present indications are that meat imports will continue to increase in 1967.

Ingredients of ice cream sold in this country are increasingly being imported from countries such as Australia, Belgium, Canada and Denmark. There are strong indications that sugar and butter fat contained in the imported ice cream mixes may come in large part from Cuba and countries behind the iron curtain. There they are produced by the equivalent of slave labor. More than 100 million lbs. of sugar-butter fat mix, commonly called Junex, entered the United States last year as these importing countries cleverly found loopholes in the tariff regulations. If, in fact, these ice cream mixes contain Cuban sugar or Eastern European butter fat, then the mixes are coming into the United States illegally. Present law forbids the importation of any product from Cuba and severely limits those imports from Eastern Europe. It is significant to note that about 36 million pounds of this ice cream entered the United States from Canada in 1966 alone. And Canada does import substantial amounts of sugar from Cuba thus raising the question whether this Cuban sugar is not used by Canadian processors to make the ice cream mix. Foreign importers have also found a lucrative market in supplying ice cream mix to the United States because they can buy the raw ingredient sugar-butter fat cheaper in foreign markets than in the United States. Obviously, the cheap slave labor that goes into preparing these products is in direct competition with our farmers and process plant workers in this country.

There are many other facts about the dairy situation in particular that should be con-

sidered. With a 2 and 7/10 billion lbs. of dairy imports (whole milk equivalent) entering our country in 1966, it is no wonder the markets for domestic producers are being usurped and prices they receive held down. In fact, last years dairy imports equalled the milk which would have been produced by over 300,000 cows or the milk production of more than 6,000 dairy farms with 50 cows each. Think what this would mean from the standpoint of labor and additional equipment required. Processing and manufacturing plant workers would have benefited accordingly.

Also, remember that it was only last spring that the President followed the Secretary of Agriculture's advice in raising the cheddar cheese import quota for the fiscal year 1966 from 218 million pounds to 317 million pounds.

We call to your attention, a case where a shipload of Colby cheese was brought into Green Bay, Wisconsin. This is the heart of the dairy processing industry in this country. Such tariff protection as presently in existence did not apply to the exact type of cheese that was imported although it is comparable to cheddar. It is significant to note that the President asked the tariff commission to investigate last spring with regard to raising the cheddar cheese import quota even further to 9.6 million pounds.

Other agricultural imports adversely affect a large number of livestock raisers and all those who process the livestock after the farmer sells it.

I wish to call to the attention of the Chairman, that the meatpacking plant at Hallstead, Pennsylvania is scheduled to close on June 10, 1967. This plant was primarily engaged in the slaughter of veal that were produced by dairy cows in the big milk shed that serves New York. This is just another casualty in the continuing trend that is at least partly resulting from foreign import of dairy and meat products.

On the subject of import and dairy products, Secretary Freeman was quoted as saying recently that he was confident action would be taken to cut imports within sixty days, and added that if action had been taken before now, it would have been thrown out of the courts. This claim that the administration does not have authority to act is ridiculous. A year ago (March, 1966) the President evoked an emergency provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and increased imports of certain dairy products. He could take the same emergency action today to cut imports. If the President and Secretary of Agriculture have a sincere interest in effectively curbing such imports, we cannot understand why the administration is opposing the dairy imports act of 1967 which is sponsored by some 53 Senators and 100 members of the House. In our opinion, it would constitute more effective insurance for the future welfare of those dependent on this industry.

Accurate information is not available, as to the total effect in man hours lost due to imports, so far as meat packing, food and dairy processing workers are concerned. However, it is obvious that it would be substantial.

We believe that the provisions of H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 would permit us to take such action and thereby benefit the general public as well as protect the interests of American workers, agriculture and related industry.

At this point, Mr. Frey, President of the American Watch Workers will explain the serious problem confronting this important industry.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON JEWELRY WATCH INDUSTRY AND RELATED WORKERS

(Statement by Mr. Frey)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the impact of imports over the past 25

years has reduced the American jeweled watch industry to a minimum level of operations. Unless the Congress acts, a recent tariff reduction on watches means the elimination of watch production in the United States, the transfer of high precision watch skills and jobs overseas, and our reliance on foreign sources for skills and industrial capacity we now possess. What you are considering has already happened to us. But our experience may furnish some insight as to what can happen to an efficient domestic industry and its employees when they become engulfed in a flood of imports. Serious injury is a fact of life for us—not a future fear.

Back in 1936, concessions on import rates on jeweled watches were granted by our Government in a trade agreement with Switzerland. At that time, we had about 10,000 people employed on watches at four major jeweled watch companies; Elgin, Hamilton, Bulova and Waltham, some 3 million movements were produced, and our share of our own market was better than 40%. By 1954, due to imports, employment had dropped to 5,000. Our Government then increased rates of duties on articles on which rates had been reduced in 1936. Despite that action and the efficient operations of the industry, further severe injury from imports has occurred. To make matters worse in January, 1967, the 1954 rates were reduced to those existing in 1936, placing the domestic industry at the mercy of unfair imports generated by Switzerland and Japan with cheap labor rates with which we cannot compete.

Today, there are about 2500 people employed on watches and our share of our own jeweled watch market has shrunk to approximately 12%. Production in the industry is back where it was 50 years ago when we had half the population we have today. In the past 7 years alone, Waltham went out of the watch business, the Elgin plant at Lincoln, Nebraska, shut down, the Elgin plants at Elgin, Illinois, ceased to

exist as integrated watch operations and an attempt (with questionable results) has been made to make watches at a new location at Elgin, South Carolina, and Precision Time went out of business. For all practicable purposes, only Bulova and Hamilton remain as integrated domestic watch companies. But for the advanced technology and the electronic and electric watches developed by Bulova and Hamilton, they would have followed the others out of the watch business. The domestic industry is now at a rock bottom level of operations—a point at which our Government is forced to decide whether it is needed or not and act accordingly.

The economic effect of imports on this industry has been documented by the U.S. Tariff Commission which has reviewed the situation annually. From 1936 to 1952 the build-up of imports and the accompanying injury to domestic production became increasingly evident. In 1952 the Commission found that as a result of the 1936 trade concession, the domestic industry had been seriously injured and recommended increases in duties. It repeated this warning in 1954. In that year, the President restored a substantial part of the reduction made by the trade concession. But that adjustment was insufficient to stem the flow of imports and, in effect, that action was nullified by the Swiss who reduced prices and practiced up-jeweling (permitting importers to attack domestic production with movements containing more than 17 jewels without paying the applicable duties). Other related economic factors worsened the situation—lower domestic production resulted in higher unit costs—the domestic companies started importing themselves to make more money—and the Swiss control of their labor costs maintained their rates at 1/3 of ours (labor accounting for 85% of the cost of a watch movement). The economic effect of imports since 1954 may be summarized as follows:

	Year	Amount	Percent	Percent Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Domestic production.....	1953	\$2,365,000		
	1964	1,400,000		-38
Employment on watches.....	1953		20.0	
	1964		12.0	-55
Share of U.S. market.....	1953		20.0	
	1964		12.0	-40
Idle capacity.....	1953		45.0	
	1964		58.0	+23
Sales of domestic watches as a percent of total watch sales.....	1953		67.0	
	1964		50.0	-25
Profits after taxes.....	1953		4.1	
	1964		2.2	

Recently, our Government made another thorough investigation of this situation. In March 1965 the Tariff Commission, after hearing, found that the probable economic effect of a further tariff reduction would be still more imports, a further shrinkage of our share of our own market, still further idling of facilities and more unemployment. It is now obvious to all that operations cannot be maintained in the United States without the minimum level of production that now exists.

This economic deterioration has been constant despite the recognized efficiency of the domestic industry. Bulova operates an integrated plant in Switzerland and certifies that the domestic plants are more efficient than those overseas. Our industry is the technological leader of the world. Battery-powered watches developed and marketed by Bulova and Hamilton have been the most startling development in the watchmaking art for the past 300 years. With better technology and working skills, the domestic industry has been able to compete with modest tariff protection. This is not a case of an inefficient domestic industry being unable to

meet overseas competition. On the contrary, it has an international reputation for competence and technical progress. Its problem has been unfair imports generated by Switzerland and Japan with labor rates 1/3 and 1/4 th of ours, respectively.

As for employment, the reduction of our skilled labor force to 1/4 of what it was in the post World War II period has been accompanied by developments which make it certain that the skills will disappear if our Government does not take action to prevent further deterioration. The remaining domestic managements have been induced by imports competition to import movements themselves. They have developed the practice of moving selected watch lines from domestic manufacturing to importing as soon as the item becomes less unprofitable. With each such move there is pressure to keep costs down on the lower production schedules of the remaining manufactured items. Grievances become constant. People with established piecework rates producing a fair hourly wage find themselves doing several new and different jobs for less money under reduced production schedules. Not only are

less people employed but the work becomes less attractive as domestic production drops. There is always the tendency to drop complete product lines when more money can be made by importing. It is difficult for any young man to see a career in such a picture and the future of these skills in the economy is questionable unless something is done to improve the situation. Today, employment on watches is 45% of what it was in 1952 when the Tariff Commission first found serious injury. There has been a substantial shift from manufacturing to importing. There is no place for displaced employees to go and still maintain their high skills. It takes very few people to prepare an imported movement for sale. The importation of complete movements and watches is in sight. The steady downward trend and dissipation of the skill is reflected in the attached table.

The essence of watch skills is the capability of applying extremely close tolerance to very small pieces on a mass produced basis—constantly improving the state of the art. This reservoir of skills will exist only so long as operations continue. It takes a long time to build the combined research, design, tooling, and production skills into integrated operations but they can disappear very quickly if not used. It took Bulova more than 15 years to put together an integrated watch operation in this country. Some of the higher skills require 10 years or more of training and experience before proficiency is reached. Once gone, it takes a long time to reestablish this industrial capability. As stated in the Staff Study of this industry made by the Department of Labor in 1957: "... It is reasonable to believe that it would take years to establish watch manufacturing organizations comparable to those now operating in the United States even if workers with requisite skills were available."

The importing community can be expected to ask the Congress to continue to free up trade but our Government can also expect them in turn to be fair. Where the objective is destruction of an important domestic capability, we must be on our guard, care must be taken to insure that we do not lose something we need as we negotiate trade agreements with our friends in the free world. Unfortunately, in the watch case, the prime force generating watch imports has not been well motivated.

The Swiss Cartel wants to eliminate our domestic production capability. The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York found that the Cartel has been seeking since 1931 to cripple U.S. production (U.S. v. Watchmakers of Switzerland et al.) and that its purpose is to eliminate our more progressive technology which is a threat to their world monopoly objectives. The Cartel has the support of the Swiss Government and even today continues to press for tariff reduction and the scuttling of what is left of our domestic production. They learned nothing from this suit which established their violations of our anti-trust laws. They still seek by trade negotiations to obtain a monopoly of our home market—something which our Department of Justice sought for 8 years to prevent. By contrast with our situation, Switzerland leads the world in the production of watches, supplying 45% of the world's needs. It has a severe labor shortage and must import 25% of its labor overall and 10% of its watch labor force. It does not need the 12% of the American Market which we hold, yet it pushes for 100% of our market with the obvious objective of monopoly.

Our experience prompts us to suggest that whenever there is a serious economic condition caused by imports, the Government should take a good look and determine on the basis of national interest factors whether we need that particular industrial capability or not. Once gone, it is difficult and expensive to rebuild it and, if national defense interests are involved, there may be no time

to re-establish it. There may be skills and technology which we want to preserve. We should know what we are doing before we let an important industrial capability disappear through imports. Domestic manufacturers can readily convert themselves into importers and can usually make more money in doing so, but the jobs, skills and technology are thereby exported overseas. If what we are about to lose is important, we should not hesitate to protect it. National defense interests, as well as general economic factors must also be evaluated in cases of economic illness due to imports. In 1964 the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigated the defense interest in this industry as it had done before in 1954. It found that the industry is making a very special and substantial contribution to our military, space and missile programs; that it is constantly improving the state of the art; and that it contains a reservoir of skills which we should preserve. As stated in part in the Subcommittee report:

"The domestic watch industry contains a unique pool of skilled workers for the sort of microminiaturized precision work involved in specialized timing devices. These workers are particularly skilled and essential in the engineering and tool and die categories. Many of the workers require 10 or more years of training and experience in order to become skilled in their lines of endeavor. There is a need, therefore, for preserving these skills within the borders of the United States for the purpose of our national defense program."

The Subcommittee emphasized that all major powers of the world have supported the growth of their watch industries and that we should not permit ours to disappear; that these skills cannot survive on defense work alone which does not provide a sufficient flow to maintain essential productive capacity; that these skills cannot be mothballed and that non-watch operations have neither the time nor the funds to develop this combination of skills required for defense needs and improvement of the state of the art. It concluded that all doubts should be resolved in favor of retaining this industry and that we should be self-sufficient in the skills we need. On the basis of tariff and defense findings, it is apparent that recent tariff reduction will mean elimination of this industry which we need. Jobs and facilities will be transferred overseas and in times of emergency we will have to rely on foreign sources for skills we now possess.

The watch story also demonstrates how complex our Government has become and how at times our well-intended programs conflict. For many years we have provided for duty-free entry of goods through certain of our own possessions. Section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930 has permitted entry of goods from the Virgin Islands free of duty so long as the landed value in the United States is not less than twice the value of foreign parts used in the Virgin Islands production. The rub is that assembly is considered manufacture and some unexpected problems have recently arisen from the application of that long-standing policy.

For example, if watch parts imported into the Virgin Islands cost \$3.00, assembly can be completed in the Islands and the watch sold to a U.S. importer or distributor for \$6.00 with no duty required. In the last 6 years, watch imports from the Islands have grown from 5,000 per year to more than 5 million movements (mostly of Japanese origin). All imports hurt and can cause injury whether they come from our own possessions or directly from a foreign country. We must re-examine our duty-free arrangements in the light of these developments.

The Congress has no responsibility to the Swiss Cartel and its world wide monopoly. The Cartel needs no help from the Congress,

and it has taken the fruits of our market while violating our laws.

The people of the United States rely on the Congress to protect their interests and do not expect to lose something which is needed. It is in the interest of the people that we retain what is left of this efficient industry that is important to our interests.

U.S. employment on jeweled watches, 1950 to 1964

1950	9,872
1951	8,379
1952	6,561
1953	5,951
1954	4,199
1955	4,072
1956	3,955
1957	3,621
1958	2,598
1959	3,517
1960	3,448
1961	2,688
1962	2,508
1963	2,685
1964	2,476

We suggest that adoption of proposed amendments H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 would permit and help insure that interested parties could obtain necessary hearings and relief when needed. It is evident that further investigation of the cases we have cited, and many others of comparable nature, would be in the best interests of all concerned in this country.

We cite these facts because it is often difficult for our organization to obtain hearings that will bring all the facts before members of Congress and the public. Unless a fair hearing is obtained in a timely manner, the damage is already beyond repair.

I wish to thank the Committee for its consideration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEEDS (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for May 1, 1967, through May 5, 1967, on account of illness.

Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BIESTER), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BIESTER), for 20 minutes, on May 4; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 1 hour, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland.

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. HAGAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 617. An act to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 889. An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 2, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

719. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Acting Secretary of Commerce, and President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies on U.S. participation in a proposed increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and on a proposed modification of provisions for the election of the Bank's Executive Director (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

720. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

721. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings available through the use of for-

mal advertising in contracting for automotive tires and tubes, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in costs of transporting food donated for distribution abroad, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

723. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copy of an order entered in a certain case, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

724. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 6, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Callente Creek stream group, California, requested by resolutions of the committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted January 31, 1946 and March 22, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5702. A bill to remove the 5-acre limitation on the amount of tobacco allotment acreage which may be leased (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8265. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 9575. A bill to exclude U.S. Route 22 from Haafsville to Easton, Pa., from being on the Interstate System and to provide for the designation of an alternative route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 9576. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 9577. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a liberalized child-care deduction as a trade or

business expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9579. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 9580. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL (by request):

H.R. 9581. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage investment in the independent American Great Lakes merchant marine by providing a program of assistance in the construction of vessels, to correct inequities, to stimulate the domestic commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9582. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):

H.R. 9583. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9584. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9585. A bill to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of grants and fellowships to improve the education of students attending institutions of higher education in preparation for entrance into the service of State, local, or Federal governments, and to attract such students to the public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9586. A bill to prohibit age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9587. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 9588. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds for the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9589. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY (by request):

H.R. 9590. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9591. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for physical therapists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9592. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that independent laboratories which meet State licensing requirements may participate in the supplementary medical insurance bene-

fits program without having to meet additional Federal conditions or requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9593. A bill authorizing the Great Lakes Commission to appoint a member of a river basin commission for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 9594. A bill to designate Ozark Lock and Dam (lock and dam No. 12) on the Arkansas River as the James W. Trimble Lock and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9595. A bill to regulate and prevent burdens upon commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of money earned outside of a State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9597. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9598. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring Madame Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 9599. A bill to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 9600. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9601. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to provide relief against discriminatory employment and housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, to extend the life of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 9602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 9603. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9604. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 9605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, for 1968 and 1969, the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$800, and to provide that for taxable years beginning after 1969 such exemptions shall be \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9606. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, and Mr. ZOLLAND):

H.R. 9607. A bill to authorize the Secre-

tary of the Interior to enlarge and improve the research facility near Bruceton, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9608. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9610. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9611. A bill to provide for the payment of supplemental annuities under section 3(j) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to certain additional individuals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9612. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9613. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 9615. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself, and

Mr. DENNEY):

H.R. 9616. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9617. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 9618. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9619. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9620. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 9621. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9622. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Major Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, with respect to the widows of certain such persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9623. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9624. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9625. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter-dollar pieces with a likeness of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur on one side, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9628. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9629. A bill to transfer the Sequoia National Game Refuge to Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9630. A bill to provide that nonprofit hospitals shall be subject to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9631. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 9632. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 9633. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9634. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 9635. A bill to authorize additional funds for research and development of noise suppression in connection with jet aircraft engines; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9636. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9637. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the ef-

fective date of award of certain claims for disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9638. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that children adopted by U.S. citizens shall acquire U.S. citizenship automatically upon the fulfillment of certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9639. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9640. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Madam Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9641. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 9642. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (for himself,

Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. FINO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TENZER, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 9643. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9644. A bill to authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security, consumer protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 9645. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the

income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 552. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 554. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

H.J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 19 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 462. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of "Activities of Ku Klux Klan organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

176. By Mr. BARING: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal that would provide that voting polls close simultaneously across the Nation; to the Committee on House Administration.

177. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal to approve and fund a new multipurpose building at the Stewart Indian School, Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

178. Also, memorial of the Legislature of

the State of Nevada relative to a proposal that legislation be introduced to allow deviations from the Uniform Time Act of 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

179. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal that legislation be enacted limiting imports of butterfat and nonfat milk solids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

180. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the State of Nevada receiving its rightful share of funds provided for public lands and highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9647. A bill for the relief of Evripides Thomas Kofos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9648. A bill for the relief of Rosa Binetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9649. A bill for the relief of Paolo Giannetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9650. A bill for the relief of San Lutfrya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9651. A bill for the relief of Peter Tsandilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9652. A bill for the relief of Reverend Vito Francesco Brancatella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9653. A bill for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9654. A bill for the relief of Nicolò Miri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9655. A bill for the relief of Vuong Thi Bick Tuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9656. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in approximately 263.2 acres located near Columbia, South Carolina, to Rockie Realty, Inc., and Robert F. Lindsay, the joint owners of such property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9657. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Huat Nio Tjio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Concern Expressed About Irresponsible Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am seriously concerned about recent events involving irresponsible persons. In my opinion, draft-card burning, draft evasion or the encouraging of draft evasion

are seditious acts and should be punished under the law. If our present statutes are not sufficient, we must strengthen the laws on draft evasion.

I am sick and tired of the Justice Department stretching the first amendment to cover up these acts of sedition. The Cassius Clays, the Stokely Carmichaels, and the Martin Luther Kings continually commit these crimes against their country on the pretext that we are not formally at war, and because the Justice Department refuses to prosecute them. We are just as much at war as we were in World Wars I and II and Korea.

These contemptible creatures are apparently willing to accept all the benefits

of American citizenship, without lifting a hand to help protect and preserve this country.

National School Safety Patrol Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution today to pro-